

AWARD TO DR. STEPHEN K. BAILEY FOR BOOK ENTITLED "CONGRESS MAKES A LAW: THE STORY BEHIND THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute or two to make a brief comment upon a book which I think is deserving of commendation.

For many years the Woodrow Wilson Foundation has been giving an annual award to the best publication in the field of government and democracy.

The award for 1950 has recently been presented to Dr. Stephen K. Bailey for a book entitled "Congress Makes a Law: The Story Behind the Employment Act of 1946." It is such an excellent account of the legislative process as it is practiced that it is worthy of these favorable comments which I make with respect to it on the floor of the Senate today.

The reasons why Dr. Bailey's book was chosen were well stated in the citation that was made by Prof. Charles Fairman, of Stanford University, at the Political Science Association convention here in Washington, D. C., on Thursday, December 28, 1950. As the citation suggests, Dr. Bailey's book is a fascinating combination of political analysis and good literature.

I rise to mention this book, however, not to pay any further tributes to its author, but to point out to the Members of this body that the award to Dr. Bailey is in a very meaningful sense a tribute to one of our most distinguished colleagues. I am referring, of course, to the very distinguished senior Senator from Montana, who contributed more than any other single person to the development of the Employment Act of 1946, whose "spark of will," to use one of Bailey's phrases, "transformed an idea into a specific legislative proposal" whose youthful energy, unflagging courage, and warm personality have endeared him to even those who may not agree with his ideas.

Too often, after a bill has been enacted into law, the great contributions made by its congressional sponsors are forgotten. Too often, Members of Congress labor long and tirelessly on weighty matters of state and not until they have passed from the scene is their stature appreciated—even by their closest colleagues.

It is, therefore, a source of deep gratification to me that Dr. Bailey's book has been paid such a signal compliment, for through it and the attention it will receive more and more people will come to understand the great contribution to the work of this body and the future of this country that has been made by the senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Professor Fairman's citation of Dr. Bailey's book, to which I referred earlier, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION THAT WENT WITH THE WOODROW WILSON FOUNDATION AWARD WHICH WAS PRESENTED TO DR. STEPHEN BAILEY THURSDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1950, AT THE POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION

The citation was read by Charles Fairman, Stanford University.

"The Woodrow Wilson Foundation Award of 1950 for the best publication in the field

of government and democracy is made to Dr. Stephen Kemp Bailey for his book entitled 'Congress Makes a Law: The Story Behind the Employment Act of 1946.' Columbia University Press is the publisher.

"Mr. Bailey chose a significant task of manageable proportions, and executed it with imagination and entire adequacy. Law-making in the midst of concerted efforts to convince and even covertly to impose upon the human mind is a major aspect of our democracy. The quest for security in employment at useful work reflects a universal aspiration that taxes the present capacity of free government. The Employment Act of 1946 is notable as a datum point in this current democratic movement. Mr. Bailey has traced the impulses that promoted and shaped this legislation—carefully, wisely, luminously. His work discloses initiative and persistence in the pursuit of his inquiry, and measured judgment in the formulation of conclusions. There is a freshness in presentation and a tidiness in execution that are particularly worthy of emulation.

"The book falls within the Wilsonian tradition. This congeniality is suggested by the fact that at the head of each chapter Mr. Bailey has set a pertinent quotation from Wilson's Congressional Government. As with Wilson, the author would 'make self-government among us a straightforward thing of simple method, single, unstinted power, and clear responsibility.' It is evident that Mr. Bailey took pains in organizing his account, in penning tight sentences and coherent paragraphs, in revising until clear thought found expression in efficient language. Even by Woodrow Wilson's severe standard, this essay is sound politics and good literature."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to take advantage of a lull in the Senate proceedings to take care of matters which have accumulated on my desk for quite some time.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 22, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17 (legislative day of January 8), 1951:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Calvin E. Wright, of Rupert, Idaho, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Idaho, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

V. Allan Hubbard, of Chaffee, Mo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 45, with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo., to fill an existing vacancy.

Mr. Hubbard is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the one abiding certainty in the midst of all the mutations of time and the only ultimate source of

our confidence as we face perplexing circumstances, Thou knowest how often fear and doubt rob us of peace and make us apprehensive of the future.

Grant that our baffled minds and fear-stricken hearts may be inspired with the cardinal virtues of faith and hope as we wait upon Thee and continue faithfully and heroically to champion the cause of righteousness and justice.

We pray that our devotion and moral courage may be kindled and strengthened with a clear vision of that blessed time when, through our trust in Thee and our own best endeavors, we shall achieve life's noblest goals of peace and good will.

May the day soon dawn when the selfish ambitions, which enslave the souls of men and nations, shall be forever supplanted by the Christlike and magnanimous spirit of brotherhood and friendship.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 17, 1951, was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to use today the special order granted to him for yesterday, following the other special orders.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the present inflationary picture is a sorry one indeed. The efforts of the Economic Stabilization Administration to handle and to cope with inflation and price gouging have been very weak and ineffectual. It has been in operation 3 months—3 months marked by timidity, confusion, muddled words, and frenzied inaction.

Run-away prices have been a national scandal since June 25, 1950. At that time, I advocated a wage and price freeze across the board, but was unable to get any action. The Congress, the administration, and the officials selected to supervise the Defense Production Act of 1950 have all fallen down on the job to control inflation.

Mike Di Salle, Price Director, was reported last week to have been ready to impose a 30-day price-wage freeze, but Mr. Alan Valentine, Director of Economic Stabilization Administration, said, "We have come to the conclusion that we do not plan any present across-the-board freeze of prices." What does he mean and who is he trying to help—or to shield? Certainly not the people of this country who are being harassed by the constant increases in everything they have to buy.

Mr. Speaker, the ineptitude of the ESA is such that it should either be abandoned or a new and strong group of officials named to administer the program. How are you going to collect taxes if this inflationary spiral keeps up, and how are you going to impose new taxes if inflation continues?

This is no time for voluntary price controls or vague talk. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that an over-all price-profit-wage control be imposed before another week of profiteering passes by. The people are demanding action and have been since June 25, 1950. The price scandal means cruel and inhuman punishment for thousands of our citizens and imperils our defense effort. The period of inaction in the price-control field has created confusion, bitterness, and frustration.

Big business can—and has—increased prices; organized labor can—and will—demand wage increases; the farmer is protected by support prices; but the great middle group—people living on servicemen's allowances—unorganized white-collar workers—school teachers, State, county, and municipal employees—older persons living on pensions and annuities—all are having trouble making their savings stretch and warding off inflation. Furthermore, redemption of E bonds for the past 9 months have exceeded sales which indicates that people are being forced to spend beyond their incomes and that inflation is our No. 1 and most serious domestic problem.

The times call for equality of sacrifice in the payment of taxes, the granting by Congress to the Department of Agriculture the right to sell stored commodities to force down prices and the imposition of direct controls and price ceilings to keep down prices to stop inflation.

We need:

First. A real excess-profits tax of 100 percent above normal peacetime profits—average profits run 51 percent over last year and some corporations' profits as high as 286 percent.

Second. Elimination of existing tax loopholes so that our economy can be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Third. A roll-back on prices to halt inflation.

Fourth. Legislation to end commodity market speculative profiteering.

Fifth. A halt to nonessential Government expenditures.

The picture of inflation is a very dangerous one. The need for drastic action is now and I urge that we enact legislation to roll back prices to October 1, 1950, although I would personally prefer to have the date set at June 25, 1950. The people want action and they are looking to this Congress for leadership and results in the fight against inflation.

GOVERNOR BYRNES, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 16, accompanied by many

distinguished Members of Congress, representing both Houses, I attended the inaugural ceremonies of South Carolina's seventy-eighth Governor—one of my constituents—James F. Byrnes. Assembled in Columbia was the largest crowd of people ever to witness such an event in our State. As the Representative in Congress of our State's most distinguished first citizen, I rise to express our deep gratitude for the honored presence of so many representatives of the Federal and State Governments. During the crisp noon hour thousands of eager people listened to the words of our esteemed fellow citizen to whom has come more public honors than any other South Carolinian. This great statesman, who enjoys the confidence of the vast majority of our people, spoke not only as the new chief magistrate of our Commonwealth but as a world statesman. Those who expected bitter words of criticism were disappointed. In clear, understandable language, he issued a clarion call to all Americans to rally to the support of our great Nation during these, the most trying hours of history.

Thus, in presenting our new Governor, South Carolina again joins hands with her sister States in pledging her all to the end that our free way of life may be continued, and that other sons, regardless as to circumstances, through work and prayer, may achieve the highest distinctions within the gift of our people. I am sure the people of South Carolina will give Governor Byrnes their wholehearted support as he discharges his duties in the office of chief executive of our State.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Saturday, January 20, to file a report on the bill H. R. 1724, and that if anyone desires to file a minority report on that bill he may have the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CHARLES E. WILSON

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I hope every citizen heard, or has the opportunity to read, the speech made by Mr. Charles E. Wilson, our Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in Philadelphia on January 17.

The speech had a logical and confident tone. Without minimizing our difficulties and the dangers of our situation, the speaker emphasized factually our full capability to meet and discharge, without fear or confusion, the duties that have devolved upon this generation of Americans. The approach of the speaker was that of a man who is working diligently to reduce our complex problems

to manageable proportions, and to solve them.

In the process of actively doing and seeing what can be done, Mr. Wilson obviously suffers none of the frustrations which afflict so many who seem able to do little more than to daily lament our weaknesses in an ignoble spirit of defeatism. We need more confident, lucid explanations like that of Mr. Wilson, and we owe him our thanks for his splendid talk, and also for the service he is performing for the Nation.

I join with him in believing that our best hope for peace is through full mobilization of our power and that to accomplish this mandatory controls will be required. I am sure most people will be glad to know that any doubts within the ODM relative to the need for legal controls have apparently been resolved. We all dislike controls, but rapid price increases have made them necessary.

ENLISTMENT OF GERMAN AND JAPANESE NATIONALS IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in the hope that I may clear up certain misunderstandings which seem to have arisen in regard to legislation I have proposed, authorizing the enlistment of German and Japanese nationals in the Armed Forces of the United States. Some Members have stated that they understand that my bill would mean the establishment of a German army under a German chief of staff, and subject to German political control, and a similar Japanese army under Japanese command. This is not the intention of the bill. In fact, I have specifically provided against any outside or foreign control. The bill proposes that we deal directly with the individual in Germany, and in Japan just as we deal with the individual recruit at home. It simply provides for recruiting offices in these countries, not embassies. It proposes no dealing with any foreign government.

My bill would simply allow German nationals and Japanese nationals to enlist as soldiers in the Army of the United States, where they would be directly accountable to their American officers, with absolutely no diplomatic interference.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to call particular attention to the cost of such a program. We have spent approximately a billion dollars in Germany last year in order to give the German people dollar buying power. We have spent hundreds of millions for similar purposes in Japan. These expenditures amount to nothing more than gifts. My bill provides that foreign nationals shall be paid in their own currency. If we were to use the same number of dollars to pay the salaries of German nationals in the United States Army, which we have contributed to the German economy, it would create exactly the same buying power in Germany, and we would be getting something for it, rather than giving our

money away. The bill contemplates that we should pay German nationals who serve in our Army, in marks, and pay Japanese in yen. The marks would be purchased from the German Government for dollars, and the yen from the Japanese Government. Each country would still get dollars, and they would be just as good dollars as if we had given them to these people.

I cannot understand why we should object to letting the money we give foreign countries purchase something for us, particularly when it could help us as well as the foreign nation. I cannot understand why some of our diplomats want the United States to always pay and never receive. I cannot understand why some of our military people want American boys to do all the fighting and dying, and object to any program which would even allow foreign nationals to carry part of the load.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

REREFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bills H. R. 1080 and H. R. 1085, and that they be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ROBERT E. LEE AND EDGAR ALLAN POE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is one of the outstanding birthdays in America.

January 19 is the birthday of Robert E. Lee, acknowledged by leaders everywhere to be the outstanding commander of the English-speaking race. Teddy Roosevelt said that of him and General Maurice of the British Army, in his recent book on Lee the Soldier, placed him above Wellington as the greatest commander of the English-speaking race.

Today is also the birthday of America's greatest poet, Edgar Allan Poe, who was born on January 19, 1809. The one outstanding American poem in which critics have never been able to find a flaw is Poe's Raven.

I sometimes think of that raven as sitting above the door of the House of Representatives of the American Congress and representing the specter of international inexpediency, which threatens our destruction.

SOCIALISTIC LEGISLATION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the three messages recently sent to the Congress by the President are definite proof to me that the freedom of the American people is threatened almost as much at home as from our foes abroad.

The financial solvency of our Nation is our first line of defense, and the first duty of the Congress is to protect it.

In his never-ending call for more spending and higher taxes, in his recent budget request for \$71,000,000,000 for the coming fiscal year, President Truman, if the Congress approves, will slug the taxpayers of Illinois alone for \$5,376,000,000 as its part in taxes for his hysterical program of tax till it hurts everyone.

Mr. Speaker, his messages again call for the enactment of his political Fair Deal socialistic legislation, including millions of dollars for socialized medicine, the Brannan farm plan, socialized housing, and other similar schemes all of which were rejected and defeated in the recent election.

The people of my State of Illinois, and the Nation as well, will support us Members of Congress who will oppose such unnecessary expenses, and who know that with the cooperation of the President we could and should cut his budget request by over \$7,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress will support extraordinary appropriations for preparedness and national defense which is the all-important problem now, but I, and many of my colleagues, shall oppose the President's attempt to incorporate his socialistic schemes in our rearmament program.

FAIR DEAL AS USUAL

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1951, the Chicago Daily News published an editorial, entitled "Fair Deal as Usual." It is startling indeed to note the comments about the Fair Deal "hitching a ride on the war machine." If I can judge the temperament of the people today by the expressions contained in the many letters that I am receiving, I venture a guess that a resurrection of the Truman welfare program will meet with decided opposition from within Congress as well as outside of that august body. If the welfare state program is to be resurrected and exploited as a Fair Deal measure, it is indeed an impropitious time to do so when lives and property are being seized in preparation for war. It is apparent that the people are definitely alerted to the dangers of having the socialistic schemes embodied in the welfare program revived and promoted at a time when the resources of the country are being mobilized to fend off the attacks of our enemies both at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including as part of my remarks, the editorial to which I have referred and which is as follows:

FAIR DEAL AS USUAL

The Truman Fair Deal has hitched a ride on the war machine. In his budget message, the President made it clear that while lives and property are being seized in preparation for war, his shopworn socialistic schemes are to be promoted under the guise of aid to mobilization.

The Brannan plan of farm subsidies, for example, is trotted out as a "redirection of the farm program to provide a greater contribution to the defense effort." The idea is to pay farmers from the Treasury the difference between a "fair" price and what they receive for certain commodities. The effect is to transfer to the taxpayers part of the cost of the Nation's food bill.

He wants more social security, more unemployment compensation, more public works, health insurance, more grants to the States, Federal money for schools. He wants more money to finance the white-elephant International Wheat Agreement, and more money for foreign economic aid to "stop communism"—some of it for Tito.

In his state of the Union message, the President advised that the country "must practice rigid economy in its nondefense spending." His budget reveals the insincerity of those words. No wonder that Senator HARRY BYRD, who really believes in economy, terms the proposed budget "the very height of fiscal irresponsibility."

In the projected spending of \$71.59 billion, only some \$20 billion was accounted for in detail. The rest is subject to military and foreign-aid planning, still too vague to permit estimates of allocations.

There is, for example, no agreement on the size of the Army we are to have. Senator DOUGLAS is advocating Armed Forces of 6,000,000 by the end of the year. The Pentagon has set 3,500,000. But with nobody yet certain what kind of a war we are preparing to fight, the ultimate figure might be anywhere in between.

But for the Voice of America, the overseas information broadcasts that are supposed to be making converts to our side—although with indifferent success, so far—Mr. Truman is quite definite. He wants to triple the appropriation, and spend \$166,000,000.

Point 4, the celebrated plan for bringing more prosperity to neglected corners of the earth, is lumped in with other foreign aid. But the Marshall plan is to continue after 1952, and Greco-Turkish aid will go on, all labeled as increasing our ability to resist Russian aggression.

The projected tax bill will be the heaviest in history, higher even than those of war-time. That is necessitated by the necessity to prevent inflation while we spend a proposed \$60,000,000,000 on our defense program. It might be noted also that nearly \$9,000,000,000 in trust funds, from social-security taxes and the like, will also be spent, but will not be included in the estimates of income.

We are probably to have rationing—and maybe short rations. It is certain that millions of young men will be snatched from their families and careers, and put into uniforms, some for the rest of their lives.

Under these circumstances, it is appalling that the President should have been unwilling to forego a single item in his box of vote lures. Coat them as he may with defense arguments, they remain the political stock by which the Fair Dealers hope to perpetuate themselves in office.

It is Congress which will have to impose priorities on the uses to which taxes shall be put in time of grave national danger. Mr. Truman is as unconcerned about waste as he is about unprecedented taxes. His budget places Congress on notice that the danger is internal, as well as external.

FEDERAL TAXES

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have a 30-minute special order for Monday, during which time I shall orate on Federal taxes. My theme is going to be, "Where are we going to get the money?" I expect to give a thumbnail sketch of the Federal tax system and point out what we can do and should do and what we cannot do and should not do. After my statement I will invite questions and any challenging of the figures I use.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AND ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Mobile Press and Register of Mobile, Ala., in commendation of a statement by our distinguished colleague, CLARENCE J. BROWN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to my friend from Massachusetts and the House that, in addition to the program for next week that I announced yesterday, consisting of two bills, if a rule is reported out on the bill (H. R. 1) to authorize the payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of a gratuitous indemnity to survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in active service, and for other purposes, that will be programmed for Wednesday after the armed services bill. I have reserved the right to object to this request simply to make this announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FIRST SUCCESSFUL LANDING AND TAKE-OFF OF AN AIRPLANE FROM THE DECK OF A NAVY SHIP

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two news articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I had occasion to visit the Navy Building at Eighteenth and Constitution Avenue and there to view a very impressive display commemorating the first successful landing and take-off of an airplane from the deck of a Navy ship 40 years ago yesterday. The display is most interesting and impressive. It includes pictures of the historic event taken at the time and it includes the original motor of the plane and the propeller which was slightly damaged at the take-off when the plane struck the water.

I was especially proud to witness the recognition extended by the Navy to the pilot of that plane. He was Eugene B. Ely, an Iowa farm boy, who was born and raised on a farm just east of Williamsburg in Iowa County, Iowa. He was a test pilot for the Curtiss aircraft firm at the time of the historic flight.

The Washington Daily News of Thursday afternoon, January 18, and the Washington Post of Friday morning, January 19, carried news items announcing the commemoration of this historic event by the Navy and I am including the news articles herewith:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of January 18, 1951]

NAVY RECOLLECTS AN IOWA FARM BOY STARTED IT ALL

NEW YORK, January 18.—The Navy quietly observed today the fortieth anniversary of a historic event that started a revolution in modern warfare.

On January 18, 1911, an Iowa farm boy named Eugene Ely made a bumpy landing in a Curtiss biplane on a crudely erected platform aboard the armored cruiser U. S. S. *Pennsylvania* in San Francisco Bay.

Ely's plane was the first to make a successful flight from shore to ship, and for a few hair-raising moments, the daring young pilot thought he would crash.

His flying machine roared toward the 119-foot-long wooden platform at about 60 miles an hour. Ely slowed down to 40 miles per hour as he approached the cruiser.

Three pairs of landing hooks built into his plane missed the first 11 lines which connected sandbags aboard the platform. But the hooks grabbed the next 11 lines and Ely's two-wing machine came to a stop only 30 feet from the ship's stern.

After an hour of hand-shaking with officers and crew members of the *Pennsylvania*, Ely climbed back into his plane and flew back to the airfield at Tanforan, 10 miles away. Thus he completed the first round trip between shore and ship.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 19, 1951]

FORTY YEARS AGO, PILOT LANDED ON A SHIP

Forty years ago yesterday, an airplane made history when it made the first successful landing and take-off from the deck of a Navy ship.

Yesterday, the Navy celebrated the day by placing a display of equipment and photographs in the lobby of the Navy Department building at Eighteenth Street and Constitution Avenue NW.

Included in the display are photographs made of the flight and of the pilot, Eugene Ely. Naval aviation began in September 1910 when Capt. W. L. Chambers began a study of aircraft for use with the fleet.

He persuaded Ely, a test pilot for the Curtiss aircraft firm, to find out whether a plane could be launched from the deck of a ship. Ely flew off the U. S. S. *Birmingham* as it lay moored at Hampton Roads, Va.

Then, on January 18, 1911, Ely landed a plane on a platform aboard the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania* at San Francisco and took off for a land base. Small boats were placed near the *Pennsylvania* to aid Ely if anything went wrong with his flight. Sandbags lined the runway, attached to taut lines across the deck, slowing the plane as it landed.

The Navy's display also includes the engine and propeller used in the old Curtiss plane and a series of pictures showing the development of naval aviation through the years.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OUR FAR-EASTERN POLICY

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the UN has a solemn obligation to brand the Chinese Communist regime as aggressors in Korea. Our State Department has finally faced the facts by the introduction of such a resolution. There can be no equivocation on this move, but will that be enough? Obviously no. I strongly urge that the following steps be taken by us and our allies in the Far East. If not, our troops should be evacuated from Korea immediately.

First and foremost we must bomb the Chinese Communist supply bases in China itself. The White House, the Department of State, and some in the Pentagon have for some unknown reason withheld such badly needed aid to our land forces in Korea. How can the Commander in Chief justify a ban against Air Force bombing of vital targets in China proper? With our valiant troops pressed to the breaking point, such a restriction on our Air Force is totally unwarranted.

The following information has recently come to my attention and illustrates how unwise some of our top policy decisions can be. The Chinese Communists have at Mukden the largest and most efficient arsenal in the Far East. Reports indicate that this arsenal now supplies, and has for some time supplied, the Chinese Communist ground troops with practically all of their weapons. One all-out bombing raid by our vastly superior air strength would destroy this arsenal. The benefits to our hard-pressed GI's in Korea would be tremendous. Why will not the President, the State Department, and the Pentagon give General MacArthur the right to strike at the very heart of the Chinese Communist strength? There is no satisfactory answer from the President and his advisers. While the casualty lists steadily mount, our diplomats talk by the hour. Congress and the American public should not tolerate this situation any longer. Give General MacArthur the "go signal" and destroy this arsenal and other Communist supply bases.

In addition to all-out bombing of the Chinese Communist strategic targets such as the Mukden arsenal, the United States Navy and other UN naval units should impose a blockade on the coast of China. The Chinese Nationalist forces under Chiang Kai-shek should be sup-

plied with military equipment and from bases in Formosa should be permitted to attack and invade the Chinese mainland. This "second front" in China is long overdue.

The fallacy of fighting the hordes of Asia on the ground is obvious. We are bleeding ourselves to death, which is just what Stalin wants us to do. It is utter stupidity to continue such a policy when we are not fighting with both fists. For too long a time our State Department has pursued a policy toward the Chinese Communists of "an olive branch in one hand and a half-loaded pistol in the other."

A long overdue show-down is imminent in the United Nations. The fate of the UN may hang in the balance on the vote on this resolution by the United States which seeks to brand Red China as ruthless aggressors. If our alleged allies fail to support the United States in this crucial hour, we should forthwith withdraw from the organization. The facts are clear-cut, and if the members in the UN run out now, any hope for the free world in that organization must be abandoned.

THE CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, the Medal of Honor, which is more commonly termed "The Congressional Medal of Honor," was originally authorized by an act of the Congress in 1861, during the Civil War period. This legislation was revised in 1916, to establish the Army and Navy Roll of Honor, and to further provide, upon application, a monthly pension in the sum of \$10 to these signally honored veterans for the balance of their natural lives, after they had reached the age of 65 years and were completely separated from the armed services.

The legislation I have introduced in the House today will repeal this statute of 1916, and will provide a special monthly pension for these outstanding veterans in the amount of \$250 for the balance their natural lives, payable from the date of their application for admission to the Army, Navy, or the Air Force Roll of Honor.

You will note that my bill provides for the establishment of an Air Force Roll of Honor, as it should be under the unification system of the armed services, and it removes the 65-year-old qualification provision. The bill retains the provision of complete separation from the armed services, thereby withholding payment of this special monthly pension to officers or enlisted men who are drawing regular retirement pay, since veterans in this category are still considered a part of the armed services.

This bill I have introduced is specifically intended to increase the special monthly pension benefits, and to pay such benefits to these veterans during their period of life when they can enjoy

them and use them to practical advantage. Such would not be the case after they have reached the age of 65 years, since the majority of these veterans are deceased before that age is reached.

The Medal of Honor is the greatest decoration and highest honor than can be conferred upon members of the armed services, in the name of the people of the United States, through their duly elected representatives in the Congress. It is awarded to these veterans in conjunction with the following citation, "for having in action involving actual conflict with an enemy distinguished himself conspicuously by gallantry or intrepidity, at the risk of his life, above and beyond the call of duty."

Since 1861, some 3,000 of these awards have been made and today there is slightly over 400 of these thusly honored veterans living and registered on the Army and Navy Rolls of Honor. I doubt that we will ever have more than that number on these rolls at one time, in fact it is reasonable to assume that we shall have less since only 531 of these medals were awarded during the World Wars I and II, some of them posthumously. Today their ranks are fast diminishing, particularly those so honored during World War I.

Rather than give the men of these fast fading ranks the paltry sum of \$10 monthly, as a practical reward for their gallant and outstanding military service in the defense of this Nation, it would be better to forget them entirely. When these veterans were so signally honored, and the memories of their conspicuous deeds were so fresh in our minds, we eulogized them, publicized and wined and dined them upon their return to their homes, and then promptly forgot them.

It is known that there are current instances of medalists in straitened financial circumstances to whom an allotment of a fair and reasonable pension could represent freedom from want, an objective to which the Nation should stand committed.

I, for one, believe the time has come for correction of our thoughtlessness. I do not believe the rank and file of the American people ever intended or believed that these veterans should have been forgotten in a practical sense.

I have, therefore, introduced this bill in the House today to insure economic security to these gallant men and hope and believe that I shall have the support of the majority of the Members of this Congress in support of the enactment of this legislation.

Surely this is the very least a grateful country can do to evidence its ever-continuing interest in its outstanding war heroes.

I submit the following table showing the total of these awards to date:

Total of awards for the Congressional Medal of Honor	
Army:	
Total awards since 1863.....	2,119
Awards prior to World War I.....	1,723
Awards during World Wars I and II.....	396
Navy:	
Total awards since 1863.....	916
Awards prior to World War I.....	629
Awards during World Wars I and II.....	78

Total of awards for the Congressional Medal of Honor—Continued

Marine Corps:	
Total awards since 1863.....	193
Awards prior to World War I.....	98
Awards during World Wars I and II.....	86
Coast Guard: Total of awards since 1863.....	
	1

NOTE.—The Army records include the Army Air Force during World Wars I and II.

Available statistics from the Army and Navy Departments indicate that approximately 400 recipients of these awards are still living.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday and Thursday next for 10 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, not since the birth of this Nation have its people experienced such a feeling of frustration and uncertainty as seems to be in evidence everywhere today. The fight for our independence was an inspired struggle sustained by a burning ambition and love for freedom. The great civil conflict in which passion met passion brought forth cohesion and greater love of country. Then two great world wars were determined by the might and patriotic action of our people who charted a course and set sail with a confidence and sureness which must attend ultimate victory.

These same Americans, all a part of this generation, who have made possible these last two victories, and who so earnestly hoped for an era of peace and understanding between nations, now find themselves involved in a political and military quagmire from which there seems to be no release obtainable. Hence the predominant feeling of frustration.

It is more than passing strange that this feeling should be abroad in America—a country well known and famous for its unstinted support of its fighting men wherever they have been committed. From some quarters doubt is expressed about the sureness of the leadership of our Nation. Others would blame our Military Establishment, while Congress comes in for its share of the criticism. But, Mr. Speaker, I have my own ideas about the underlying cause for this strange and almost unbecoming attitude of the American people. I lay it directly at the door of a timid and vacillating United Nations organization. What was once hoped to be a great forum for world peace seems to have turned into a great arena where the most vicious international politics are being played at the expense of American blood and prestige. While the United States awaits

the pleasure of the UN to act on the all-important question of declaring Red China the aggressor in Korea, our troops continue to bear the brunt of overpowering attacks by the Red hordes. The American people have been patient and Congress has been more than patient, hoping that the UN would meet its responsibility in a forthright and courageous manner. It is obvious now that good faith on the part of some of our allies in the UN is sorely lacking, and that these timid nations are plunging a dagger into the heart of the UN. That it is dying of its own nonfeasance is tragically true. The failure of the UN to declare the Red Chinese as aggressors has had a far-reaching effect throughout the world. It has not only hurt American prestige, but it has shaken world faith in the integrity of the UN. It has also revealed to Russia a weakness in the UN which is gratifying to them, to say the least. What are our fighting men and those from other nations in Korea saying about this weak-kneed attitude in the UN? Does this tend to stimulate their will to endure the frigid conditions of Korea while they fight an almost hopeless holding war?

While our delegates to the UN have demanded action, I doubt that they have employed language and unveiled threats of sufficient consequence to jolt the UN into action.

As one who has steadfastly supported the United Nations, I have reached the point in my thinking where I am ready to issue an ultimatum to the UN saying without reservation that you either proceed forthwith to brand Red China as an aggressor, or the United States will withdraw from the UN.

This may seem to be a harsh declaration, but timid approaches to this question have failed. It may be said by some that our withdrawal would result in the death of the UN, and perhaps it will, but its collapse is assured anyway if it continues to play politics with this China question. China is in the role of a traitor in her aggression in Korea. China has become an international ingrate in her sell-out to Russia. Whatever her good reasons for civil revolt may have been, there is nothing to justify her attack on the United States in Korea. Our Nation has been a benefactor to China's people and for the UN to refuse to take cognizance of these facts renders it unfit as a forum to determine international problems.

Great Britain has certainly contributed nothing toward securing favorable action in the UN on the China question. She again weighs her position in international trade against loyalty to her one dependable ally in the world. Britain's fear of Russian aggression toward the west has dimmed her view of the tragic situation in the Far East. Britain's and America's interest are inseparable and it ill becomes Britain to drag her feet in the UN while we suffer for her failures.

Although I firmly believe that the ultimate showdown between communism and democracy will come in Western Europe and we, as a nation, must contribute a large share toward Western European defenses, we cannot in good conscience write off Asia to communism.

Should the Reds drive the UN forces out of Korea, we could expect them to continue their drive until Japan was completely conquered. The Philippines would be next in their march of aggression.

It has been suggested that we have only two alternatives in Korea—one to make all-out war, and the other to get out. This seems to be true at this time. It is quite clear that China will not settle this issue except on her own terms—terms utterly reprehensible to us. First of all, they would have us withdraw all UN troops, thus putting South Korea in the same danger she was on June 25, 1950. How ironic this would be when we pause to consider our dead and wounded, as well as the total havoc and destruction of the cities and villages of South Korea.

The pages of American history will never become too yellowed with age as to blot out the record of our cowardice if we bow down to those heathen Reds or leave Korea anyway except by force. America is a sleeping giant today while her sons glorify themselves in combat under the most adverse conditions ever known to American fighting men. There is no place for defeatism in our far-eastern effort. This conflict is but a forerunner to others of greater intensity. China should be warned by the United States that unless she shows a willingness to truly compromise the issues involved that the weight of our power—full force—and that of Chiang will be released against her. We are shackled now by the United Nations in a fashion heretofore unknown to this Government. It has placed us at a disadvantage from a military standpoint. Too much reliance has been placed in the UN by the people, and especially by our national leaders, for a diplomatic settlement of this conflict. Too many of us have expected the UN to come up with a magic formula to suddenly halt the war in Korea. What has been the net result? Nothing more than a dangerous cease-fire order which would ultimately mean, if accepted by the Reds, sacrificing Formosa to the Chinese and admitting Red China to the UN.

Congress has a very special responsibility in this grave crisis. As the sounding board of American sentiment it should give some expression of its views to the executive department and to those representing us in the United Nations. I believe strongly that Congress should give prior approval to the commitment of troops in foreign soil and I am convinced that the entire Asiatic situation should be debated to the end that a more positive and definite policy may be established. Is there anyone today who can accurately say what our aims are in Asia? How long are we going to fight China with one hand tied? Are we going to defend Japan if routed out of Korea? Are we going to utilize the army of Chiang? Are we going to wait another 12 months to arm Japan? These are the questions deserving an early answer. It will be too late if we defer positive decisions much longer. Our vitality is being sapped by this freakish war, while our prestige in the world sinks lower and lower. To those who say that the answer is to with-

draw from Korea, I would reply that to haul down the flag of our country is an insult to our traditions. Let it be shot down if it must, but hauled down, never.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman, in my opinion, has rendered a very important patriotic service in making vocal the smoldering wrath of the American people.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has made a most courageous speech for which I commend him heartily. I just placed in the RECORD an editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar which I commend to the reading of all Members.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also commend the gentleman on a very fine speech. He has given a true picture of the current international situation. I join with the gentleman in expressing the hope that the United States will withdraw its allegiance from the United Nations and reaffirm its allegiance to the United States.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN ENTANGLEMENTS

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, the gravity of world events and uncertainties in our domestic economy make it incumbent upon us to reexamine our international policies, from time to time. They should be studied in an effort to determine whether our objectives, for which we have given so much blood and treasure, have been achieved.

We entered World War I with the slogan "to make the world safe for democracy," and now there is less democracy in the world than has been seen for generations. We fought a second war to rid us of the menace of dictatorship, only to find a decided increase in the number of dictators, and one at least more menacing than before. In the attainment of these two primary objectives we have failed miserably.

A third objective is founded upon the belief that if we pour our billions into England, France, and the Low Countries, we shall find them standing by us as allies in a third world war. The failure of this objective will bring us the greatest disillusionment and the most humiliating disappointment of all. If anyone believes that England and France, for example, will stand by our side in a third world war, he is indulging in wishful thinking.

The governments in those countries are much more in tune today with Russia than they are with our free-enterprise system. For confirmation, we have

only to look at England with a former Communist as War Minister, and France with one-third of her Parliament claiming membership in the Communist Party. The Communist Party in France is now the largest single influence in that republic. It is larger than any other political party. The armies of France were paralyzed at the start of World War II by turmoil in the government—there is no reason to expect more favorable conditions should we engage in a third world war.

Anyone who understands the Governments of England and France as they exist today, and who believes that those countries will lay their cities open to the attack of atomic or hydrogen bombs by Russia, is just not facing situations realistically. Their attitude toward and their lack of cooperation in the Korean conflict give rise to the belief that their policies will be to drift gradually into neutral corners in the hope that when the blows fall they may escape. If America fights a third world war, there is every reason to believe we shall stand alone.

Some of our leaders in government have tried to be great internationalists—a stage of action for which, by previous traditions and experience, they were ill-prepared. During this indulgence in internationalism we have piled up a Federal debt that threatens to undermine our domestic economy; we see the threat of a third world war which if continued for any length of time will break us financially; we see the loss of many liberties at home, and a threat to a free-enterprise system which has furnished us the means whereby we can keep the lifeblood flowing in Britain's Socialist Government.

These things we have achieved under the banner of internationalism, but they were not our stated objectives. In those we have failed notably. I am primarily an educator. I am in politics in the hope that I may serve our Nation's welfare and for no other reason. But I submit to you, if an educator, after setting up a group of objectives and spending huge sums of money, should miss his mark so widely, that educator would be out of a job.

The time has come when we shall have to think seriously of America first of all. If it is true, as many believe, that we cannot expect much help from European nations in the event of conflict with an aggressor, then let us make this country strong enough to fight its battles alone if need be. This will not be the case if we continue to distribute our manpower and our remaining wealth to the four corners of the earth. We had best keep our guns and ammunition at home because there is not complete assurance that those guns will be pointed eastward in the event of a third world war.

Let us try with every means at hand to preserve the peace and prevent another struggle with the calamitous effect that would follow in the wake of modern warfare, but let us not delude ourselves in the thought that other powers will fight those battles for us. That objective will fail as the others have failed. It is my judgment we shall stand alone, and

we must build our strength and conserve our wealth, because as a Nation in that struggle, if it comes, our very existence may be at stake. God forbid that it should come, but there are ideologies on the march in the world today which may compel us to take militant issue.

Some men who are prominent in the field of education and in politics support the theory of a world government as a solution to international problems. A world government is a visionary dream that is bereft of practicality. There is no way in which the various concepts of governments can be reconciled. We even have divisions in opinions here at home. The scheme of gathering all of the ideologies of the world under one government is an undertaking beyond the scope of human effort. Russia has the solution for a world federation in which everyone should be a Communist. We certainly do not wish to live in that type of society. On what basis may we assume that all nations would agree to any proposals we might offer for a world government?

Our duty, it seems to me, is clearly laid out. We must begin to think of saving America first of all. We must conserve our resources. We must keep our people not only militarily strong but strong in the faith in our American way of life that has set us apart from other peoples in so many accomplishments. We must be able to cut through the ideologies of the Old World and awaken new hope in the perpetuation of those freedoms which have made it possible for our country to shoulder such a large share of the burdens of the world today.

A Russian leader by the name of Lenin said a quarter of a century ago:

Russia will not have to fight America because America will spend itself into destruction.

On another occasion he said:

The easiest way to promote a bloodless revolution is for the currency of a nation to commit suicide.

We must not permit those dreadful prophecies to come true.

Our President has said:

We shall resist aggression in any part of the world.

I submit to you we have neither the manpower nor the means to shoulder a responsibility of that magnitude. The highways of the world are strewn with the wreckage of nations and empires that have indulged in ambitious programs of this character. If the pages of history are not sufficiently revealing, let us take a lesson from what is happening in Korea today.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I desire to commend the gentleman, this schoolmaster from Illinois, a State of great school masters, on his intelligent and courageous discussion.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I wish to commend the splendid address of my colleague from Illinois. May I ask, buttressing his thought, is it not a fact that England and France have wrecked themselves in two world wars, and we have had to help them get them back on their feet? After having spent \$60,000,000,000 in the First World War and \$400,000,000,000 in the Second World War, if we continue to try to carry that load on our back is it not beyond peradventure of a doubt that if we go into a third world war we will wreck this country financially and lose our own liberty?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

DECLARING THE CHINESE COMMUNIST AUTHORITIES AN AGGRESSOR IN KOREA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 77) and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations should immediately act and declare the Chinese Communist authorities an aggressor in Korea.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know this resolution will be overwhelmingly adopted by the Members of the House. It is a very short resolution, but one that has been very carefully worked out by responsible Members on both sides. In offering this resolution, I am happy and proud to say, and I want the record to show, that it constitutes the joint action of my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and myself, I as majority leader of the House of Representatives, leader of the Democratic Party in this body, to make the record more specific, and my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] as minority leader, leader of the Republican Party in the House.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Can the gentleman tell the House whether or not a similar resolution has been introduced in the other body?

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand a resolution the substance of which is similar has been introduced in the other body.

Mr. STEFAN. Have similar resolutions been passed by the House of Representatives on other international questions such as this?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state that now.

Mr. STEFAN. Does this set some kind of precedent?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no precedent on this, because the United Nations is something of recent origin.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is not the present situation utterly unprecedented in the history of the Republic or the history of civilization?

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman. My friend was asking me if there was a precedent for this. I assume there are precedents involving important matters in the past, but certainly this is an unprecedented time. The resolution is offered under the conditions it is because of the fact this is an unprecedented time.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it not a fact that our delegation to the United Nations have already made such a request of the United Nations, that the United Nations as a whole declare the Chinese Communists aggressors?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. It is my understanding that the request has been made of the General Assembly as distinguished from the Security Council, because in the General Assembly the veto cannot operate, whereas it could operate in the Security Council. My understanding is that this is a matter which is now being debated before the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. When was this resolution introduced—just this morning?

Mr. McCORMACK. The resolution is introduced now.

Mr. GROSS. With no other notice of it?

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman the matter has been very carefully looked into and carefully screened and cleared by responsible members of both parties.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman intend to ask for a roll-call vote on this resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope there will be no request for a roll-call vote on the resolution. There will be no necessity for that.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I happen to have some knowledge of the background of this resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I may interrupt the gentleman, I want to say that the gentleman has plenty of knowledge about the resolution. I want the record to show that, because the gentleman from Ohio was one of those Members who very kindly and courteously discussed the matter with me. Therefore, I know the gentleman knows a great deal about the history of the resolution.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand, the agreement between the leadership is that the program today should be noncontroversial. I wish to say I can imagine nothing more noncontroversial, and nothing on which there could possibly be less controversy in the House of Representatives and among the American people than the pending resolution. I am sure it will not be necessary to have anything but a voice vote on the resolution, because the action of the House, so far as that is concerned, will be unanimous.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman because this resolution shows clearly, not only to the country but to the world, the bipartisan unity of sentiment—the unity of sentiment which exists among all of us as Americans—and many people abroad, particularly those in totalitarian dominated countries or their regimes had better not fail to understand and appreciate the significance of the spirit of America.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman, one of the ranking minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I certainly will support the resolution. However, I think it is rather unusual for the resolution to be presented at this time when it was announced there would be no business. I, for one, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, never knew a thing about it. I am wondering if the matter ever was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I state to my friend the reason for bringing it up today is because of the exigency of the moment. I appreciate the fact, of course, that this is an unusual procedure, but this is quite different from the general legislative business which we all want to have referred to the legislative committees. But unusual circumstances call for action today, if we are going to take any action on the resolution at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I believe most of the members of the committee were in town and it would have taken 10 minutes to get together. I think we ought to have known something about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot challenge the gentleman's statement in all sincerity and honesty; but so far as the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, I exhausted all means in my power to ascertain the views of all persons and agencies who might be interested in this, both officially and unofficially, and to see whether or not the necessary screening could be made and clearance obtained for the consideration of the resolution. I can assure my friend that it is only as a result of my feeling that the Members of the House, fully realizing the responsibilities falling upon them as legislators, and particularly the leadership of the gentleman's party, especially with relation to this particular question, would act upon the resolution after it has been screened that I offered the resolution having in mind the importance of the timing. Who can tell what will happen in 48 hours? It was felt that it was very important that this matter be acted upon today. With that I think my friend will not feel disturbed about not having been consulted.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield. I was going to yield time to the gentleman in his own right.

Mr. RICHARDS. I thank the majority leader. Like the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], I am very jealous of the rights and prerogatives of

the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. Ordinarily I would insist that the resolution be referred to our committee. But this is no ordinary occasion. Time is so short, the issue so great, and the necessity for action by this House is so impelling that after talking with the majority leader, the minority leader, and a number of members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I feel that it is in the national interest to pass this resolution today.

The first meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee has been set for next Tuesday and that may be too late for effective action. I believe every member of the Foreign Affairs Committee agrees with the purport of this resolution. I believe every Member of the House who seriously considers the issue involved will be for it, and I hope that it will be passed unanimously.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I merely wish to make the observation that the acceptance of this resolution without protest will evidence that on matters affecting the security of the Nation unity is an actuality.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I presume this resolution will be passed, but I do not want it construed, as far as I am individually concerned, as indicating a willingness on my part to turn over to the so-called United Nations the right to declare war for the United States or to tell us where to go and fight whose battles.

Everyone knows that while the so-called United Nations declared this emergency, they have called on the United States to do practically all the fighting, called on our boys to do practically all the suffering and dying, and now the United States will be called upon to pay the bill.

I do not want this action construed as expressing a willingness to send our boys into China to bog down and lose a million more American men. As far as I am concerned, I am for getting out of the United Nations and having American affairs run as the Constitution requires.

I am not for surrendering our prerogatives to any foreign power or group of foreign powers.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are you going to yield any time to other Members to discuss this matter?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I told the gentleman I would yield him time in his own right, and I try to keep my word.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's resolution. I was interested to know whether the gentleman feels the same revulsion that I have for the cease-fire order which would oblige us to consult with Soviet Russia and Red China and the British Government about

Formosa and similar matters of that kind.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to the gentleman that that is water over the dam now. We know of the action taken by the United Nations General Assembly. We know of the action taken by those in control of the Chinese people on the mainland of Asia. That is water over the dam, so my opinion on it at this time would be more or less irrelevant. This is another issue and another question and another proposition.

Mr. HALE. If the water is over the dam, well and good. I hope it is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I know that our distinguished majority leader, before introducing this legislation, discussed it thoroughly with the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], with the ranking minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYRS], and with the acting chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], as well as other members of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Fortunately I met our friend the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, a few minutes ago and showed it to the gentleman. There is a lot of work in connection with it, you can understand, and I can assure you that as far as I am concerned everything was done from my angle to contact the Members who have a responsibility in this House on this question; but, again, these are all matters which come to a head very quickly if they do; they either do or do not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure every Member of the House recognizes that insofar as this particular resolution is concerned, time is of the essence.

I hope that this action expressing the sense of this great body will be a matter of evidence and will receive the deepest consideration by the representatives of all the countries that comprise the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says that time is of the essence in this matter. I remind him that time is of the essence in a number of matters, including doing something about these abnormal prices.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but I wish now to confine myself to this issue.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I understand. Now I wish to ask the gentleman a question: Is it possible to have this resolution read at this time by the Clerk so that we may know what we are discussing?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may again be read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the resolution.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at this particular time the United Nations is really on trial. The New York Times carried an editorial this morning headed "UN on trial." I agree with this. This resolution is a matter of paramount importance and it should make a powerful contribution toward the efforts of the representatives of those countries who are members of the United Nations, particularly those representing countries outside of a certain group, in doing the things they should do not only for today but for countless years to come, if the United Nations is to have even the possibility of becoming a powerful instrument internationally for good.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cooperate with my friend, the distinguished majority leader, in support of this resolution. If I had any regret it is that the resolution had not been submitted several weeks ago. Particularly, I wished the resolution could have been submitted before the so-called appeasement cease-fire vote of several days ago. But be that as it may, the resolution is here, and I hope it is the beginning of a new, of a different course in the Orient than we have followed in the past. Surely the majority leader can be forgiven for not having the bill referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That apparently would have been impossible under the time-limit needs. I understand the United Nations will vote on Monday. We are therefore justified in taking it up by unanimous consent. And I do hope that it will be a precedent in one way. The people of the United States can speak only through their membership in Congress; and the people of the United States are vitally concerned not only with what goes on in the Orient but in Europe as well. We have had far too little real consultation in the past. Congress has had little if any influence in directing our foreign policy. I am somewhat surprised that the present resolution has come to us and I do hope it is the beginning of a departure from secret diplomacy. I join in this resolution and I hope it will be passed unanimously so that the people of the world will know how the United States feels about Communist China.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think we can get a resolution through this fast invoking the price and wage controls that we passed last summer?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Massachusetts is not a crystal-ball gazer and cannot answer that question.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am wondering how much notice the distinguished minority leader had on this proposed resolution?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I may say in all frankness that the gen-

tleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYRS] spoke to me about it yesterday. I told him I was in favor of the resolution. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] just before the legislation was offered today spoke to me and asked me if I was in favor of it. I told him that I would support it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. It seems to me, then, if some members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House had 24 hours' notice there is no good reason why all of the members of the committee should not have been on notice.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would not say that is necessarily a fact. When I discussed this subject with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYRS] yesterday none of us thought it would come up today. It was my belief it would just be considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee. However, I can realize the urgency of the resolution to be acted upon now if it is to have any effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that what the gentleman says in reference to this resolution coming up today is absolutely correct. However, there are so many things to do it is one of those things that comes to a point with suddenness. The gentleman's statement, though, is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Things like this come up unexpectedly and change a legislative program. All understandings are subject to change, should anything out of the ordinary develop, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has proceeded in good faith.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have no objection to the resolution. It is probably a step that should be taken. But I wonder what the effect will be when word goes out over the country that it was adopted unanimously and only a handful of Members present, and that word will go out. If we want this resolution to have effect, should there not be present here a quorum? I am not asking necessarily for a record vote.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman that there is a substantial number about, and if it is adopted unanimously, that would indicate unquestionably that there is little objection to it among the full membership.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Is it not a fact that passage of this resolution by the House of Representatives here today practically declares war against Communist China? Is it not tantamount to that? Is it not a fact also it is immaterial to precedence and what Members were notified and who were not, it is a matter that this country in general will consider a declaration of war by this

body against Communist China? I shall vote against this resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What we are going through in Korea is pretty close to that.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I wonder if it would not be well to direct this at Communist Russia rather than China?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think the Congress of the United States should have been consulted before the United Nations plunged us into this war or before our troops were sent there without our consent? Does not the gentleman think that the Congress of the United States that is charged by the Constitution with the responsibility of declaring war should be consulted before our troops are sent to foreign countries to fight anybody's war?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think I made myself clear upon that point. I stated that I hope that this will be a precedent for continued consultation with Congress when all great questions of policy are involved. Congress represents the people.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not want this to go down as a precedent or as an indication that the Congress is surrendering its power to this so-called United Nations, this Tower of Babel in New York.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I heartily support this resolution. I regret it comes so late. I can well understand why it needs prompt action. This sort of House action should have been taken before this.

Ten days ago, on January 9, I made a speech on this subject stating that the United Nations, unless it took the action recommended in this resolution on Red Chinese aggressors, was headed for its last roundup. My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] made a speech the same day to the same effect; my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] had made a similar speech the day before. A number of Members discussed the advisability of having some sort of resolution, and we contacted the majority leader. We Republicans did not want to have any resolution introduced which would, because of inaction on it, give anybody the idea that the Congress was not interested. Therefore, those who have been interested in this matter did not want a resolution introduced unless we felt fairly certain that it could have support on both sides of the Chamber, and a chance to have it cleared for floor action by the House leadership. I brought up the question of this type of resolution and this sort of action in the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East, which was meeting informally in our committee room, and there was some discussion

of it there. All members of the committee were invited to that meeting but, as has been already stated, our committee is not yet formally organized for this session.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. That is one reason I think we should adjourn right now and get this thing off the board, because the gentleman does not speak for the Republican Party.

Mr. VORYS. That is right. I have not been attempting to speak for the party or for the minority on the committee. I am merely saying that I am familiar with a great deal of consultation on this subject with members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in the room of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but there was no resolution for the committee to act upon formally. Now, I think the trouble with this resolution is that it was not introduced some time before, so it could have been referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee. But our delegation in the United Nations is pressing for action there, and unless action is taken today by the House, it may well be that our delegation in the United Nations will not have the moral support that might come from this resolution. I am, therefore, willing, reluctantly and regretfully, to have our committee bypassed.

Let me say this in answer to some things that have been said:

The UN, despite its weaknesses, has been at least a symbol for the expression of the collective moral judgments of mankind on international questions. If it fails to say soon and overwhelmingly that Communist China is an aggressor in Korea, it will have failed of its purpose, reduced to its lowest common denominator. What the free world can do about aggression, how to do it, involves questions upon which there can be honest differences of opinion. What civilization can do about crime is always a question, but whenever civilization fails to recognize and denounce crime for fear of the consequences of its own moral judgment, civilization is gone. I do not think that civilization has failed in this crisis. If, however, the United Nations fails to record the moral judgment of civilization by recognizing and denouncing this aggression in Korea, it is headed for its last roundup. I hope that, in this grave crisis, the representatives of the free nations of the world act wisely, rightly, bravely, and soon.

With Red China slaughtering Americans every day, I cannot understand those who fear that this action may provoke them. They seem rather thoroughly provoked now. United action by the United Nations will be more likely to calm them down and sober them up than to provoke them.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman on the Com-

mittee on Foreign Affairs if they have had a full meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. VORYS. No; I do not believe there has been a full meeting of that committee. The chairman of the committee has been ill. However, some of the subcommittees have been meeting, not to consider legislation, but to obtain background material and to discuss informally the various and vexing questions that face us in our international relations.

Mr. BUSBEY. Could not the Committee on Foreign Affairs report this resolution out in 24 hours?

Mr. VORYS. I certainly think they would if they got the chance.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, permit me to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who has so graciously granted me this 3 minutes that the time was not requested because of any desire to obtain publicity. Permit me also to congratulate the gentleman upon the superb strategy, the outstanding generalship he has shown in presenting this resolution at this time in its present form. Few leaders of a majority party have the ability to obtain from a minority party, which for weeks and months has been vigorously criticizing and condemning a major policy of the majority, an all-out endorsement. Mr. Acheson and Mr. Truman have jacked this country into a position where they can get world war III without a declaration of war by Congress. The gentleman gets an endorsement of that policy by the opposition.

Just how, when, and by what method the Republican leadership was taken into camp is not known to the minority membership. From the debate so far it appears that but one member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] had knowledge of the intention to take up this resolution today, after we were earlier assured that no controversial business would be brought up today.

The statement of the next-to-the-ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the minority side, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has assured us that, until the resolution was introduced, he had no knowledge of it. It did not come to the House from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, nor with the approval of that committee. Nevertheless, it is here.

The resolution itself is a tricky, weasel-worded, double-talk proposal. It is so worded that no one can vote against it without voting contrary to well-known facts.

The resolution calls upon the United Nations to declare the Chinese Communists to be the aggressors in the present situation. Everyone knows that the North Koreans were the aggressors when they crossed the thirty-eighth parallel.

Everyone knows that at the present time the Chinese Communists are the

aggressors. Unfortunately now, and for some weeks past, successful aggressors.

The resolution is tricky because if one votes in accordance with the fact, he must vote for the resolution. But on the other hand, a vote for the resolution will be construed as a vote in favor of United Nations. I want none of United Nations.

Tomorrow the papers will be saying, as will the New Deal internationalist editors, columnists, and radio commentators, that the House—Republicans included—notwithstanding the November vote of the people to the contrary, gave all-out endorsement to United Nations. That the Congress of the United States, notwithstanding the sentiment expressed in the Midwest against surrendering our sovereignty to the United Nations, putting our trust, our confidence, our destiny in the hands of United Nations, is endorsing United Nations with all its blunders, is calling for all-out war by asking United Nations to declare the Chinese Communists to be the aggressors. Having declared the Chinese Communists to be the aggressors, the next, the only logical step which will be to ask United Nations to declare war against China. Who will fight that war? The United States.

In the days to come Republicans are going to hear a great deal about the action of the House which will soon be taken. In the days to come we will be told that we have committed ourselves to two things:

First. That we have endorsed and placed our future course of action in the hands of the United Nations.

Second. That by our action today, having requested the United Nations to declare the Chinese Communists to be aggressors, we have, by implication, asked the United Nations to declare war against China.

Added up, the adoption of this resolution is an endorsement of the policy of Acheson, of Truman, of involving us in world war III. It will be cited as a commitment to any war which United Nations may declare.

Bitter, disastrous experience in Korea tells us that the burden of carrying on this war, no matter where it may be fought, will fall upon the United States.

This declaration adopted today is a commitment, we will be told, to the sacrificing of the lives of perhaps a million or more young Americans in what I consider to be a hopeless effort to, with land armies, win a war in Asia—another one in Europe.

Humbly, may I ask, is it not cowardly, is it not a confession of incompetency, of a lack of ability, of statesmanship, for the Congress to ask a powerless, quarrelsome debating society like United Nations to determine the foreign policy of the United States?

In November the people expressed dissatisfaction with the foreign policy of the Achesons, of Mr. Truman. The people do not want war. They certainly do not want a war which is to be fought by foot soldiers in China, in Asia, in Europe, against overwhelming numbers for the salvation of so-called allies who will not do their share of the fighting.

If the internationalists in Congress, if those who are determined to involve us in an all-out world war III, want that issue decided by the Congress, why not bring it up by a plain declaration which all can understand?

Parliamentary procedure prohibits an accurate, adequate expression of opinion as to the method which has been followed in connection with this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield. Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not possible that the adoption of this resolution will be construed to mean an endorsement of what the President has done in Korea?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, and worse than that, it is an endorsement of Acheson's incompetency. I am not so much concerned about that, for that is in the past, as I am about the construction of the resolution as it will be applied to future action. I think it is an entirely wrong procedure for any one member or two members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to ignore the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], who speaks for the Midwest. I do not see how the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYRIS] could do it; I do not see where he gets the nerve; I do not see how he can presume to come in here with that kind of thing, then try to put us on record in favor of the UN, when he knows the people of his State are disgusted with the UN.

The Republican whip was not consulted; the policy committee of the Republican Party was not consulted, so I am advised; certainly the membership as a whole knew nothing of it—there is barely a majority of the Members here.

It is a back-door endorsement of UN, of the Truman-Acheson policy, of getting us into world war III. Talk about democracy in action. Here is a procedure with but a bare majority of the House present by which, without adequate debate, we go on record endorsing UN, asking its aid, when we know it has none to give and no disposition to give it if it had. Our action today may hereafter be construed as a commitment to send thousands of our men to the slaughter grounds. I want no part of or in UN; nor am I endorsing the Acheson or Truman foreign policy.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I think this is entirely too serious a subject to continue without a quorum, and I renew my point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 6]

Aandahl	Beall	Buckley
Abbitt	Bentzen	Budge
Addonizio	Bolling	Burnside
Allen, III.	Bolton	Burton
Anfuso	Breen	Byrne, N. Y.
Angell	Brehm	Canfield
Barrett	Brooks	Case

Celler	Hébert	Patterson
Chatham	Hedrick	Perkins
Chelf	Heffernan	Philbin
Chudoff	Heller	Potter
Clemente	Herlong	Powell
Cole, N. Y.	Hillings	Quinn
Colmer	Hoffman, Ill.	Rabaut
Combs	Hollifield	Ramsay
Cooley	Howell	Reams
Corbett	Hunter	Rivers
Cotton	Irving	Robeson
Coudert	Jackson, Calif.	Rodino
Crawford	James	Rogers, Mass.
Crosser	Jarman	Rooney
Curtis, Mo.	Javits	Roosevelt
Dague	Jenkins	Sabath
Davis, Ga.	Jensen	Sadlak
Davis, Tenn.	Jones	St. George
Dawson	Hamilton C.	Saylor
Delaney	Judd	Scott, Hardie
Dempsey	Kee	Scott,
Denny	Kelly, N. Y.	Hugh D., Jr.
Dingell	Kennedy	Seely-Brown
Dollinger	Keogh	Sheehan
Dondero	Kersten	Sikes
Donohue	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Donovan	Klein	Simpson, Pa.
Durham	Lane	Stanley
Ellsworth	Larcade	Sutton
Elston	Latham	Taber
Fallon	McConnell	Taylor
Fine	McCulloch	Underwood
Fisher	McGrath	Velde
Fulton	McGuire	Weichel
Furcolo	McMillan, S. C.	Wharton
Gamble	Meck, Ill.	Whitten
Garmatz	Mahon	Widnall
Gary	Mason	Wier
Gillette	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Gore	Morgan	Willis
Granahan	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Green	Moulder	Wilson, Tex.
Greenwood	Multer	Withrow
Gwinn	Mumma	Wolcott
Hall	Murray, Wis.	Wood, Ga.
Leonard W.	O'Brien, Mich.	Woodruff
Halleck	O'Konski	Yates
Hart	O'Toole	Zablocki
Hays, Ark.	Passman	
Hays, Ohio	Patten	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 268 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DECLARING THE CHINESE COMMUNIST AUTHORITIES AN AGGRESSOR IN KOREA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, the serious situation in the world is uppermost in all of our minds. We have all lost patience with diplomatic niceties when our loved ones are being killed in Korea. Our people back home are facing the hard facts of life realistically and they are expecting our Government to act realistically. My people, and I am sure the people all over the country, want hard-hitting, intelligent leadership not only from the military, not only from the Executive, but also from the Congress of the United States. In my judgment, this is a good opportunity for the House of Representatives to demonstrate the leadership that is expected of it by the people throughout our country. It is unfortunate that the chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, Judge KEE, has been in the hospital, and that our committee has not been organized to date. However, this cannot be helped. Normally such a resolution would go to our committee before coming to the floor for debate, but there is not time for this action now.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in backing the resolution that has been introduced jointly by the gentleman from

Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], which says that it is the sense of the Congress that the United Nations should brand Red China as a world aggressor. I think it is important to take this action. The firm stand that the United Nations took last summer gave great hope for an enforced peace throughout the world.

It is very disappointing that the UN has not been stronger in implementing the action which it started. It is impossible for the United States to bring about peace in the world by ourselves so we cannot afford to let the United Nations degenerate into a mere debating society. I think we should join the executive department of our Government and our representatives in the United Nations in saying that Red China should be branded a world aggressor. I personally think we should go further and put an economic embargo on Russia and Red China. But that is not the issue here.

The issue before us today is whether or not the Congress is willing to act, to go on record and to show some leadership in strengthening the UN and in bringing about peace in the world. I hope this resolution will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there was such a small handful in the House at the time this question came up for debate, I wonder if it would not be possible to have the resolution again read to the Congress.

The SPEAKER. That can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be again read.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. Is it possible for a Member to offer a substitute or an amendment to the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Not unless the gentleman from Massachusetts yields for that purpose.

Mr. SHAFER. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want it distinctly understood in relation to the Members who are absent today, and in order that their constituents may thoroughly understand the situation, that such Members were justified in assuming that no business would come up today. However, this is a matter of such urgency that it is an exception to the rule. As to those Members who are not here today, I want the RECORD clearly to show that their absence is justifiable and, whether they are Republican Members or Democratic Members, in accordance with the announcement which I made as to the program

they were justified in governing themselves accordingly not expecting that any roll call would come up today.

I am anxious that that statement appear in the RECORD.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I appreciate the statement that the majority leader has just made for the benefit of those Members who are not here today after some of us had told them that they could be absent.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Would the gentleman join in the unanimous-consent request that all Members may extend their remarks, let us say at this point?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE UNITED NATIONS CANNOT UNITE ITS OWN MEMBERS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, we were saved from an abject surrender in the Korean area by our enemies—not by the action of the United Nations. The United Nations offered to surrender on the terms first proposed by the Communist government of China. Had this been accepted, the United Nations would have forfeited the right to further existence.

Those who are supposed to know now claim this offer to surrender to Communist China was a diplomatic act—that when the offer was made the UN knew it would not be accepted, and when refused by China, the United States could put through a resolution branding Communist China as an aggressor. Is this the kind of body the United Nations is? Do we have to go to such extremes in order to get the United Nations to act? It is obvious to everyone that when China troops invaded South Korea, China was guilty of aggression—if the United Nations does not know that much, what useful purpose is it serving? If we are to abjectly bow before the Communist invaders of Korea in order to get this body to see what is going on, and in branding it accordingly, it shows the United Nations is not able to agree on even simple things. The sooner we begin to follow our own direction and refrain from following such an impotent and useless body, the better it will be for us. Who gave the United Nations power over the sovereign United States to move as the United Nations directs in this war? If any such power was given by anyone, it was an unconstitutional transfer of the sovereign power of the people of the United States.

No unity of action can hope to be secured from this body. India wants us to clasp the Chinese Communists to our bosom like a long-lost brother, but what is India contributing to the fighting effort? Rhee, President of South Korea, says that if we permit the Japanese to rearm and enter the war, his army will fight the Japanese, yet he wants us to

remain and fight against the hordes of Communist China.

The Japanese should be rearmed. They should enter the war. Nationalist China should be rearmed, and they should enter the war. Both want to fight—are anxious to fight. And what logic is the United Nations exercising in preventing this? India does not want that to happen. England does not want that to happen. First, because India will have to show her hand—either be for us or against us. England does not want war with China; second, because she will lose her trade with the Communists, which she has already recognized. England does not want to lose Hong Kong, the center of her trade. If the wars should spread to an all-out war with Communist China, England will have to fish or cut bait. She is either with us or against us. There can be no half-hearted action taken if we intend to stop the invasion of South Korea. That is what the United Nations is up against—there can be no agreement among nations with such diversity of interests.

The purpose of the organic act of the United Nations was to stop aggression; an attack on one nation would be considered an attack against all nations in the United Nations.

How can aggression be stopped? If it could be stopped by reason and argument, then the United Nations was unnecessary. The United Nations was set up to stop aggression by force if necessary, and when force has to be used, the United Nations suddenly discovers that the available force is the United States; that other nations in the United Nations, like India, do not want to use force. England shies away from it. Western Europe has only eight divisions. South America—all the nations there—do not have a man on the battlefields. Yet they are strong in debate. Not one of these nations has stood up to the problem. They have side-stepped and let us take the brunt of the defense of their security, as well as our own.

All nations owe us money and are maneuvering to get more, and, to get right down to talking common sense, most of these nations hate us—or will if we do not give them more money.

It was a grave mistake to start loaning to these countries in the first place; it would be a bigger mistake to keep it up. If the United Nations will just fold up for a while and keep still, I think it possible for us to rearm Japan and Nationalist China and clear the Chinese Reds out of Korea. Stop that aggression. Finish our job. And then obey no more orders from an incompetent, unaccountable body named the United Nations.

Following that, we should make no move to wade into Europe to defend lukewarm nations who apparently do not want to defend themselves. We can, if we do not change our course, so deplete ourselves in resources and manpower that we shall be unable to defend ourselves.

Until the other members of the United Nations show signs of wanting to stay united and fighting in one common cause, we should not depend upon them

in the slightest degree. The United Nations got us into this war in Korea, but we cannot depend upon it to get us out.

Debate, procrastination, unlimited policy of the United Nations has clearly demonstrated that we ought never to transfer any of the sovereignty of the United States to the United Nations or any other body under the sun. The members of the United Nations will have to realize one thing clearly—that we do not need their help nearly as much as they will need ours, and that we absolutely cannot prepare for our own defense and, at the same time, prepare the defenses for every member of the body. I think it is evident that we have the spirit to defend democracy; and if our partners cannot be moved to a spirit of self-defense, it is just as certain as night follows day that the purpose and objects of the United Nations has utterly failed.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been some pretty wild remarks made here. This is certainly not a declaration of war against Red China nor is it an endorsement or ratification of President Truman's action in sending troops into Korea without consultation with Congress. The resolution merely says it is the sense of the House that the United Nations declare that the Chinese Reds are aggressors. If they are not aggressors, I do not know the meaning of the word. The United Nations should have taken this action a long time ago. If they do not do so now, they might as well pack up and go home. The American people will have no further confidence in the organization.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for some of us to understand why this resolution should come to the floor without notice to the membership or even to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House to which it should have been referred. It has been suggested that it is an emergency matter. I ask the question: Where has the leadership been in recent weeks? In what respect has the situation changed by which all at once and without notice the leadership brings this resolution to the floor?

It appears that not more than a half dozen of the 435 Members of the House even knew it would be submitted today.

It is not the resolution that I criticize, but it is the manner in which the leadership of this House and the administration it represents is handling legislation and is guiding the affairs of this country. The least you could have done is to have let this resolution go over for 2 or 3 days. If it were so important, as you now indicate, then you should have brought it before the House 2 or 3 weeks ago.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe the resolution offered jointly by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the Democratic leader, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the Republican leader, expressing that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should vote affirmatively branding Communist Red China as an aggressor in Korea, is timely and should be adopted.

There can be no logical argument against the fact that Red China is the

aggressor in Korea, and there should be no hesitation on the part of the United Nations to adopt a resolution to make this a fact and removing all doubt as to the aggressive position Red China has assumed.

In my opinion the resolution should also be adopted to uphold the hands and give support to the capable and courageous United States representative at the United Nations, Warren Austin, as well as to give support and encouragement to some of the doubtful nations that will soon be called upon to vote on the resolution at Lake Success.

It is time, and I trust not too late, for the United States to take a clear-cut and undeniable position on the Korean crisis in order to remove any doubt of appeasement or lack of courage on the part of this Nation in declaring that Red China has taken a wanton and aggressive position in Korea for which they, with the help of Soviet Russia, shall stand responsible before the peoples of the world.

All of the red tape and dilatory debate at the United Nations should be limited to a minimum in coming to a conclusion on this resolution and by the adoption of the resolution before us by the House of Representatives, we will have, in my opinion, expressed the desire and intention of the vast majority of the American people.

Those member nations of the United Nations who, for one reason or another, may vote against the adoption of a resolution branding Red China the aggressor in Korea will, in my opinion, thereby place themselves in the position of being unfriendly to the United States and unwilling to fight Communist aggression with the only effective weapons Red China and Russia will respect, namely, strength, courage, and force. Time is of the essence in this instance, and it is my hope that this resolution will be speedily adopted and that consequent effective action will be taken by the United Nations at once.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe in the principle of this resolution. There is no question, in my mind, that the Chinese Communists are aggressors.

However, I am sorry it came before the House in the manner in which it came, namely by unanimous consent obtained, when there were only a few Members present on the floor.

We all know from our experience that sometimes there are lurking dangers in matters submitted to the House for its consideration. We do not know what the ramifications of the present proposal may be. I am not charging bad faith on the part of anyone. However, I saw a statement the other day which I could not keep out of my mind as I was listening to the discussion of this resolution and when I voted for the resolution. It was made by Mr. Nehru, of India. It was to the effect that if we declare the Chinese Reds aggressors that may shut the door to further negotiations and it might start a world war.

By our vote today we have not gained one vote in the United Nations. We have a representative there, and a very capable one, in Senator Austin. Why not leave the handling of the matter to him who has been on the firing line for us

ever since the United Nations was organized. He will know how to handle it to the best advantage to ourselves and to the free world.

Impulsive actions frequently bring bad results. The world is so explosive today that we must weigh our words and weigh the consequences of our conduct as a Congress. Individual Members may make irresponsible and sometimes audacious statements. But the Congress, before it acts, should proceed with caution, with full knowledge of the implications of its conduct, and, with the background of exhaustive and intelligent investigation by one of its committees. That was not had in this case. And since our expression was not required to get the necessary votes to pass this resolution through the United Nations and since our State Department has already expressed itself as being desirous of getting such action I do not see why we should rush through Congress a bill, that in a way, strait-jackets the conduct and the efforts of our own representative in the United Nations.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, occasionally the charge is made that Congress abuses its responsibility as a legislative body. And occasionally, in the past, hasty and ill-advised action by the House has made that charge understandable.

Today, however, the Eighty-second Congress of the United States recklessly and irresponsibly abdicated its duty by adopting without serious consideration and under shotgun procedure a resolution that is fraught with unlimited perilous possibilities.

Mr. Speaker, America can probably survive a weak Congress or even a stupid one, but it cannot survive a Congress that abdicates its deliberative responsibilities.

On Wednesday, January 17, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], made the following categorical pledge to the House membership:

There will be no legislative business at all on Friday.

But at 1:30 Friday afternoon we are suddenly called to vote on a resolution of unlimited implications.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled and ashamed to be part of such a travesty on our system of parliamentary government. I protest this betrayal of our duty.

If this affair is a sample of what the American people are to expect from now on from Congress, we are already lost to totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that the procedural tactics of this afternoon will never be repeated in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives passed a resolution branding Communist China as an aggressor in the war in Korea. I voted for this resolution because I have long felt that Communist China is the tool of the Soviet Union, carrying out the aims of the Kremlin to destroy all freedom-loving nations. Certainly our boys in Korea recognize that the Chinese Communists are evil aggressors, and the American public has long been

of the same mind, despite the failure of our State Department to come to the same conclusion until a few weeks ago.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the resolution did not go far enough. The resolution should also have pointed out that the United Nations has been derelict in its duty in not taking unified action against the Chinese Communists when the first hordes from Red China crossed the Yalu River last October and invaded Korea. It has been a great tragedy that the UN has failed to awaken to the realities of the situation, instead of degenerating into a debating society over the vital and obvious fact that Red China is an aggressor. It is my sincere hope that the UN will act immediately to officially take the same stand made today by the representatives of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that as this resolution is passed by the House the same Secretary of State is still in office who fostered and developed the policy which enabled Communist China to send its forces into Korea. It was Mr. Acheson who told the American people that we could do business with the Chinese Communists and that we must force the government of Chiang Kai-shek to submit to the atheistic and totalitarian policies of the Kremlin. It was Mr. Acheson who said, "We must let the dust settle in China," and who abandoned the Nationalist Government, our wartime ally in the struggle against the Japanese, thus allowing the Red hordes to sweep across Asia.

To carry out the full intent of this resolution, which implies that we must abandon the false concept of appeasement of communism so long favored by the present Secretary of State, I urge the President to remove Mr. Acheson from his high office and replace him with a man in whom we can have real confidence at this grave hour. It is essential that this action be taken if our people are to develop a unified and affirmative American foreign policy to meet the challenge of Communist aggression at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, now that the House has taken this positive position in opposition to the aggression of the forces of Red China, I call upon the President to enlist immediately the active support of Nationalist China in the Korean War. The help of the 500,000 troops of Chiang Kai-shek now on the island of Formosa would greatly relieve the pressure on our American boys now holding the line against a numerically superior Communist enemy in Korea. It would help to return more of our boys home alive. There is no sensible reason for continuing to refuse the offer to help extended to the UN by Chiang, and I urge that we welcome the active support of Nationalist China, the only anti-Communist force in China which has offered to come to the aid of the free world.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys] and I addressed the House on the subject of the crisis faced by the United Nations. We asked at that time that this world organization realistically face up to its obligation to declare the

Chinese Communists aggressors. I shall, of course, support this resolution and only regret that the action was not taken earlier. It is conceivable that, if we had acted last week, our representatives in the United Nations would not have bowed to the demands of other members for further appeasement in the Far East.

Fortunately, the rejection of the so-called cease-fire resolution by the Peiping regime has relieved this country from the necessity of sitting down at a council table with the murderous brigands who have been slaughtering United Nations troops, consisting primarily of our own American boys.

If the United Nations now lacks the moral integrity to denounce the big aggression by Communist China as they did the little aggression by North Korea, it will undoubtedly mark the end of any usefulness of that agency for the maintenance of peace.

When the United Nations took action last June at the time the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, we assumed 90 percent of the burden of resisting aggression so far as manpower is concerned and 100 percent of the burden in financial expense, of what was designated as a police action.

In dollars we are in the red as a result to the extent of more than \$14,000,000,000. But that is only a relatively minor incident when one looks at the casualty figures and sees that our announced casualties to date are over 45,000. Of these, 8,000 have been killed. No dollar sign can describe that loss. Only the families and loved ones of these heroes can sense the true significance of our Nation's sacrifice.

If the decision taken by the United Nations in June is now to be compromised and its moral effect set at naught either because member nations are unwilling to sacrifice economic or financial advantage, or because they fear the military power of the Chinese Communists or their Russian masters, certainly it will be our obligation to reexamine our unwavering adherence to the cooperative spirit which constitutes the very lifeblood of an organization dedicated to international cooperation. While we have again and again demonstrated our willingness to make concessions for the sake of achieving unity, there is a point beyond which we cannot go in permitting our own hands to be tied and our decisions coerced. We have already passed this point. This resolution will serve notice that we in Congress realize this fact, as do those whom we represent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to commit the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD of Idaho moves that the resolution now pending before the House be committed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 30, noes 161.

Mr. SHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-seven Members are present; a quorum.

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DR. GORDON S. SEAGRAVE

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, in the passage of the unprecedented resolution a few moments ago, and which I have been advocating, and considering the world-shaking events that are taking place, it is rather difficult to resolve our thinking down to a human individual. However, I want to bring to the attention of the House today a very brief story of a great American who at this very minute is languishing in a prison cell in a foreign country thousands of miles from our beautiful city of Washington.

Briefly, I would like to submit this statement:

THE WORTH OF A HUMAN INDIVIDUAL

Mr. Speaker, the world is passing through a period of great confusion and uncertainty. It is a time when thoughts of war and the threat of war weigh heavily upon us all. This Congress once again is being called upon to consider measures of far-reaching consequence to the future of the Nation and, indeed, to the future of all mankind.

Because the problems with which we must deal are of such an enormous stature we may hesitate to concern ourselves with matters of lesser dimension. Because war is a tragedy of such incalculable proportions, we may be less inclined to dwell upon a tragedy which threatens a mere individual and his family—especially when it is being enacted in a land remote from these shores, in a setting unknown to most of the Members of this House.

But it is in the nature of our way of life that we do not ignore the individual no matter how pressing may be the tempo of the times, no matter how manifold the difficulties which confront us.

It is in the nature of our way of life to do all we can to right a wrong done to any man, and to alleviate his suffering if that be possible.

Because I believe with all my heart in this way of life, Mr. Speaker, I venture to bring before the House, the tragic story of one man. I speak of Dr. Gordon S. Seagrave. That name is vaguely familiar to most of us. The men who fought the early campaign in Burma during World War II would know it well. Countless native physicians and nurses who were trained by him would recognize it. And those of us who followed Stilwell's epic retreat into India during 1942 will remember the equally heroic story of the Burma Surgeon, who likewise authored the Burma Surgeon Returns.

Mr. Speaker, for a quarter of a century, Dr. Seagrave lived and toiled in Burma. He went abroad as a medical missionary with a dream, a basketful of salvaged surgical instruments, and a faithful wife. He went back to the land in which he was born, for generations of his family before him had lived and served as missionaries in Burma.

Dr. Seagrave did not settle into the ease and luxury of the foreign colony in Rangoon. Carried along by a driving spirit and a determination to serve humanity, he went north into the country of the Karens, a large ethnic group, which had shown much inclination to embrace the Christian faith. Among these people, in the village of Namkham, some 500 miles north of Rangoon, Dr. Seagrave and his family finally settled down. During the years that followed, he labored with these people to establish a modern hospital. He tended the sick. He trained nurses, doctors, and public-health workers. Thousands of people lived better and healthier lives because of his inspiration.

Then came the war. His hospital lay in the path of the early Japanese invasion of Burma and Seagrave was forced to leave it. He joined General Stilwell as a medical officer and throughout the conflict served with Stilwell's Chinese soldiers, receiving for his devotion to duty several decorations and the plaudits of the allied world.

With the defeat of Japan, Dr. Seagrave returned to his beloved hospital service. The willing hands of neighbors joined with his in rebuilding that remarkable center of healing in the wilderness of northern Burma.

This good man wanted nothing more than to carry on with his vital work. He had no mission, no aim, except as a service to humanity to heal the sick and to train native doctors and nurses to do the same.

Events in Burma, however, were to rule otherwise. Scarcely had that country become independent in 1948 when revolts flared in many areas. Among those who rose in armed rebellion against the Government were the Karens who believed that their group was entitled to a greater degree of autonomy than the Burmese Government was willing to grant.

Dr. Seagrave's hospital once again lay in the line of fire. This time, however, he did not leave. He felt, as he had

every right to feel, that both sides would understand his position, that they would recognize, notwithstanding the unfortunate civil conflict, that his work was for the good of their country as a whole.

The town of Namkham changed hands several times in the course of rebellion and Dr. Seagrave found himself first under one jurisdiction then under another. In these circumstances his position became increasingly precarious. He sought to do the right thing and in view of his experience this right thing was to preserve the hospital for the benefit of all Burma and to aid the sick and the hurt.

Suddenly, on August 18, 1950, Dr. Seagrave was arrested by officials of the Government of Burma who were then in possession of the town. He was flown to Rangoon and charged with treason. For weeks he languished in jail, where he suffered from serious illnesses.

His long trial began on October 12, 1950. This week, on January 17, he was convicted of treason in helping the Karen rebels and was sentenced to 6 years imprisonment. That sentence, I am given to understand, is now being appealed to the high court in Rangoon. I do not wish, therefore, to say anything here on the floor that may prejudice the ultimate decision in any fashion whatever.

I may state, however, that I have followed this developing tragedy from its inception. Dr. Seagrave's experience is but the misfortune of one man and his family—the shattering of a noble dream of service to humanity. It is, at the same time, a part of a far larger misfortune—the grave internal difficulty which confronts the new nation of Burma and the possible deterioration of relations between the Burmese and ourselves.

CONGRESSIONAL MISSION TO BURMA

Mr. Speaker, I was in Rangoon on September 20 and 21 in 1949. I was there as a member of a mission sponsored by this House. On my return, I reported to the President and to the Speaker on my observations. I had found a country—a beautiful country, highly endowed by nature—wasting away its blood and treasure in civil strife. Conditions of life were so insecure that the principal government officials found it necessary to work behind guarded barbed wire barricades.

Mr. Speaker, in these circumstances, the people of Burma—Karen and Kachin and Burmese alike—were unable to enjoy the fruits of their newly won independence. So far as I am able to determine the situation has not changed to this day. Real peace still eludes those unhappy people.

INTERNAL PROBLEMS OF BURMA

I well know, Mr. Speaker, that the internal problems of Burma must be solved primarily by the people of that country themselves. But it is the duty of all peoples, no matter where they may live, to work for peace and to speak out for peace whenever there is an opportunity to obtain it without the sacrifice of principle. In 1949, I urged that Burma seek to find peaceful solutions for

its internal problems and I do so again today. I do so, in part, because I believe such a solution to be in the best interests of that land and, in part, because I realize that if there had been peace Dr. Seagrave would be going on now with his noble work instead of languishing in confinement in Rangoon.

I repeat that I believe the internal problems of Burma must be solved by the Burmese themselves. Dr. Seagrave's case, however, appears to me to be not exclusively an internal problem. It is rather, one which has grave implications for the future of our own relations with Burma. I do not refer merely to the fact that he is an American citizen. I have in mind an observation which I made during my stay in Rangoon and which I duly reported on my return. It was my opinion then, and nothing has since occurred to change it, that American missionaries were being subjected to undue pressure and harassment in carrying on their work.

ADONIRAM JUDSON AND JUDSON COLLEGE

I refer particularly to the Judson College question which came to my attention at the time. Judson College is an institution of higher learning in Rangoon which was established some hundred years ago by Adoniram Judson and which was operated by the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society until it was closed by the Burmese Nationalist Government. Throughout its existence this school has sought to serve Christianity by serving the people of Burma. Many of the present Burmese leaders received their education at Judson. In spite of its record, however, that school has been taken over by the Burmese Government, and this Government has so far failed to pay any compensation for its occupancy, or the payment to the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society of New York City of its claim which represents a one-half undivided interest in the college.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF STRAINED DIPLOMATIC RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Seagrave's ordeal and the Judson College affair may seem unimportant in a world which is already at war in Korea and totters on the brink of a much greater catastrophe. But it is precisely in such matters—seemingly local and isolated in themselves—that friendship or enmity between nations very frequently begins.

Our country desires to maintain friendly relations with Burma. I think we have already given some evidence of our intention in this respect. When the Union of Burma obtained its independence, we were among the first nations to extend recognition. Since that time we have instituted a number of measures of cooperation. Out of funds obtained from the sale of United States surplus property in Burma, we have established a Fulbright program with that country. Under this program, it has been possible to send American teachers to Rangoon and under Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress, the Smith-Mundt Act, Burmese have been brought to this country to study and to teach.

We are now prepared to go ahead with a well-rounded program under ECA which will provide assistance to Burma in agriculture, public health, industry and national economic development. Projects are under consideration which should help the Burmese to help themselves in building a more stable, a more fruitful, and more progressive nation.

Mr. Speaker, all these arrangements represent cooperation between the people of Burma and the people of the United States. They can have a real, a lasting meaning, however, only if they are conducted in an atmosphere of trust and tolerance and respect on both sides.

DEEP CONCERN BEING EXPRESSED BY OUTSTANDING AMERICANS

It is for this reason that I particularly deplore the tragedy which has overtaken Dr. Seagrave. In a very real sense, he represented a major link in the relationship between our two countries. He is an American, a fine American who has devoted his life to serving the people of Burma. Here is a telegram which came to my office yesterday from Dr. Theodore Adams, outstanding theologian and church leader, and minister of the First Baptist Church of Richmond, Va.:

Deeply deplore action against Seagrave. Have known him for years as personal friend, able missionary, and loyal American.

This is typical of the many wires and letters which I have received. When I was in Rangoon, I had the pleasure of meeting Mrs. Seagrave, who is a noble and courageous woman. For years she worked by the side of the doctor in Burma, managing to help him in his work while at the same time raising a fine American family. She has since returned to this country and is now living in Baltimore and I have been in constant touch with her concerning her husband's plight.

THE URGENCY OF THE RELEASE OF DR. SEAGRAVE

Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to understand all the circumstances surrounding the arrest, trial, and conviction of Dr. Seagrave. I do know that the conditions of unrest which prevail in Burma and which I have described were a major factor. I do know, too, that his permanent removal from the service of the Burmese people would be a genuine loss to them and to Burmese-American friendship. It is for this reason that I am contemplating introducing a resolution in this House calling on the President to urge the Government of Burma to release the doctor and to restore him to the service of humanity.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. As a member of the Baptist denomination I want to thank the gentleman for the speech he has made here today in behalf of Dr. Seagrave. I have known of the Judson missionary movement in Burma for many, many years. It has made a valuable contribution to the life of the Burmese community. I share with the gentleman my deep concern over the arrest

and conviction of Dr. Seagrave and I am hopeful that the appellate court will reverse the lower court in its findings.

Mr. DEANE. They should. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As the gentleman perhaps knows, I served for 3 years during the war in the China-Burma-India theater and am personally familiar with the remarkable work which Dr. Seagrave did in Burma. I have been at his hospital and know of the untiring devotion which he gave to his work there. Although there may have been personality differences which caused some differences of opinion regarding his service at the time, I feel certain that I can speak for the hundreds of thousands of men who served in that theater in saying that we certainly hope there will be a different issue of the present trial in Burma than the one which has happened today. I feel sure that all of the world hopes and rather confidently expects that the appellate court will, as I would put it, see the light in this case.

Mr. DEANE. I thank the gentleman.

THE NEED OF MAINTAINING FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN BURMA AND THE UNITED STATES

In closing, Mr. Speaker, my motive in this respect, I repeat, would not be to intrude upon the internal affairs of Burma. I would do so only because I believe that the cause of friendship between our countries would be strengthened by such a course and because I believe with all my heart that Dr. Seagrave, who already has given so much to Burma, can still be of service to the people of that land. I therefore respectfully request the officials of the Burmese Government, in behalf of my colleagues and myself, and the great number of outstanding Americans who know, love, and highly respect Dr. Gordon S. Seagrave, to effectuate his release and thus avoid the strained relations that are developing in this country toward the Burmese Government because of the unjust treatment toward this great American, Dr. Gordon S. Seagrave.

ANOTHER COSTLY BUREAUCRATIC ERROR

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, a source of never-ending amazement to me is the working of the bureaucratic mind, as it may be observed here in Washington.

For the most part the bureaucrat performs a dull task, over and over, until even the reason for it is forgotten.

Small wonder, then, that he falls into a mental state wherein the task itself, rather than its purpose, becomes all-important.

Only too often, as a result, when he is faced with the necessity of a change,

even in some small detail of his routine, he becomes so confused as to make the most ridiculous errors.

We see it happen almost every day.

But this tendency toward bureaucratic absurdities is not confined to Washington alone. Wherever bureaucrats operate, sooner or later, one of these horrendous asinities crops up.

The latest to be called to my attention is described in a letter from one of my Michigan constituents.

He is one of those farmers who spends his winter evenings nowadays in poring over the complexities of an agricultural income-tax report, instead of hustling through with the chores so he may drive into town for the movies, the church supper, or the dance in the Odd Fellows hall.

Now it appears that he, and all his fellow agriculturists in the State, have been left dangling as the income-tax deadline approaches.

Uncle Sam demands, under severe penalties, that income-tax returns shall be made promptly. But the tax forms—the proper ones at least—have not arrived.

It seems that the Bureau of Internal Revenue is seeking to get away from use of the short form, 1040A, and to require that everyone possible shall use the longer form, 1040.

The purpose, of course, is to keep a closer check on individual returns, and thus discourage chiseling under the prospectively higher tax rates.

One can easily picture some bureaucratic underling, in the offices of the Michigan collector of internal revenue, deciding that here was a chance to get after those farmers who fail to report as income foodstuffs consumed off the farm.

So Michigan farmers last month received four copies each of tax return form 1040, instead of the long and complicated agricultural income-tax return.

I gather from the letter that most Michigan farmers, of recent weeks, have spent many of their daylight hours driving frantically from one village post office to another in their sections of the State, waving useless 1040 forms and demanding the proper agricultural forms.

Their evenings, it may be surmised, have been spent in worrying about the whole thing, because the agricultural forms were not at once available.

No doubt the Michigan collector of internal revenue, when the error was discovered, moved at once to correct it. But it seems to me pretty silly; this business of vainly trying to plug one tax money leak at the expense of an even greater one.

I wonder whether this kind of thing is happening all over the country.

One letter of several I have received concerning this matter follows:

HOMER, MICH., January 16, 1951.

DEAR MR. SHAFER: I wonder if anyone has tipped you off in regard to the very costly error made in regard to farmers receiving the wrong forms and being forced to chase from one post office to the other to obtain farm returns for income tax.

Last week the branch county farm bureau in a radio program explained a very con-

fusing and bothersome error had been made and farmers were receiving the wrong blanks, etc.

Then Monday along came ours and therein were four 1040 forms which, as you know, cannot be used in agriculture. If this is prevalent in Michigan, what a costly error for we tax burdened public. What an expense this is as those blanks, which no doubt cost a plenty, are thrown to the wind. To me this is gross inefficiency and in such an agency as this, should be curtailed. This probably does not come within your jurisdiction. However, it being in your district it probably is of some interest.

You need not answer this communication as it is not necessary. Far from a fair deal, it's a rotten deal to have to chase your legs off over such a mess and then listen to economy. Everywhere one meets his neighbor looking for blanks.

Yours truly,

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution passed this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, while I am looking forward to the possibility of serving on the great Committee on Agriculture in the House with anticipation, it is also with considerable reluctance that I am leaving the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That committee has served, I think, a very, very useful function, not only within the Congress but to the people of the United States.

When I first came to Congress after a special election I was assigned to the Committee on Executive Expenditures. My first subcommittee activity was that of the Rizley subcommittee charged with investigating the disposal of war surplus. That chapter in the history of our country, as most of you recognize and appreciate, was not a very happy one. Millions, yes, billions of dollars' worth of physical assets of our country were dissipated in the disposal program. This disposition, of course, at the time our investigation was taking place, had largely been accomplished, so that in essence we were more or less locking the stable door after the horse had been stolen.

The great challenge that came to me out of that experience, however, was why such an occasion should happen and what could be done in the future to prevent its recurrence. It developed during the course of our investigation that the armed services had no uniform cataloging, nor did the supply agency or the disposal agency that was charged with disposing of this material have a cataloging system whereby they could know what they had to sell and dispose of it in an orderly, efficient, and economical fashion. For this reason, as I previously

stated, billions of dollars worth of material were sold more or less on a pig-in-a-poke basis and a great loss was sustained by our Government and the taxpayers.

There is a way that this can be corrected, and I think largely as a result of the investigation of our committee the armed services through the War Munitions Board established a project designed to correct the situation. They called this the Federal cataloging program. It was designed to bring into the armed services, having been joined together as a common unit of defense, a common unit of cataloging, so that the armed services could better distribute their procurement, could make their procurement more economical, and in the event of the declaration of material as surplus such material could be disposed of by a civilian agency economically and efficiently.

The subcommittee upon which I served in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments passed during the Eighty-first Congress a bill establishing the General Services Administration. This was a counterpart attempt on the part of the Congress to set up a logical, clear-cut, and efficient agency to take care of the procurement needs for the civilian branches of our Government. It was also charged with the responsibility of distributing or disposing of surpluses generated even by the armed services. This surplus material could not, as I have previously stated, be disposed of efficiently unless the civilian disposal agency knew what they had to sell. The armed services, in embarking upon a Federal cataloging program through the agency of the War Munitions Board, estimated when it was inaugurated in 1948 that it would take 4 years to complete this project involving many hundreds of technical employees so that the job could be done efficiently and effectively.

The subcommittee of which I am a member has conscientiously followed the progress of this project. A year ago, or less than a year ago we called Admiral Ring up for a conference before our subcommittee and we asked him to give us a statement of the progress of this Federal cataloging program, which he did. At that time we urged him to step up the progress of this program so that it could be completed because even then it was evident we were going to embark upon an enormously increased procurement program for the armed services, and it was highly important that the job of cataloging, and the catalog itself, be established thoroughly before our agencies were charged with receiving vast quantities of material. They have assured us that this program will be completed during the year of 1951. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is chairman of the subcommittee that has been following the progress of this project, and just before the adjournment of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress we made a trip to the naval depot at Mechanicsburg, Pa. At that time we were impressed with the progress being made, but likewise were we impressed with the tremendous tasks in-

involved. I would like to give you just one simple little illustration, if I might, which will, I think, show the vastness of the project and how complicated it can become. We were told up there, during the course of our inspection, that as simple a thing as a cotter pin, the same identical cotter pin, had 1,108 different listings within the naval depot at Mechanicsburg. That says nothing about the listing of the same particular commodity in the other branches of the service, or even other divisions of the Navy. That meant there had to be 1,108 receptacles for this cotter pin at the depot. There was no way of knowing when the cotter pins were exhausted from one of those 1,108 compartments; there were 1,107 other compartments from which the same identical article may have been secured. So you go all through the whole series of procurement possibilities. As a matter of fact, when we totaled the items of use within the three branches of the armed services we found they totaled more than 12,000,000, and it was estimated that by eliminating duplications, and near-duplications and overlapping, the total number could be reduced to approximately 3,000,000 or 3,500,000 items.

The saving, Mr. Speaker, for the taxpayers, to say nothing of the increased efficiency of the armed services, will be tremendous. The taxes for the coming mobilization program are going to be very high; of that we can be assured. So I would say that the greatest possibility for actually saving money, to say nothing of increasing the efficiency of the armed services, can be accomplished if the Congress and the agencies which are carrying out this program coordinate their activities and insist that it not be a paper project but that it actually become a reality.

There is one other factor which I want to discuss briefly in conclusion, because it involves more than just merely a uniform cataloging system of common-use items. It involves the procurement of matériel. Let us take the subject of clothing for the armed services. There are just so many companies in this country that are capable of making and which will make clothing for the armed services. In the past we have found a great scrambling on the part of the procurement agencies of the various components of the armed services competing with one another for these production facilities. As a consequence, many times one branch of the armed services would tie up unneeded proportions of our production facilities. As a result, other branches would either have to insist upon new establishments being set up or would have to do without. So this involves a coordination of the purchasing program.

Here is another factor that I think deserves your consideration: For example, suppose there are six companies that are making clothing for the armed services. In normal times they have been producers of civilian clothing. We will say the armed services are going to require the production of about one-third of the total output. I suppose we could demand

that two of those companies convert entirely to the making of armed services clothing. In order to do that they would have to give up their civilian market, which they would be loath to do. But you could take one-third of the production of all six of those companies and they would give you a better price, because two-thirds of their production facilities would be left for the maintenance of their civilian market. So the Federal cataloging program involves more than just getting material. It involves a coordinated procurement program that will enable the various branches of the armed services to achieve their goal, and do it in an orderly fashion; and to see that each branch of the service gets its requisites, and that it does not pile up unnecessary supplies. In that way they will be assured that next year they will get their equitable proportion of the production facilities.

I particularly wanted to make this statement to the House because I think the whole idea and the whole goal is important, not only to the Armed Services Committee and to the Appropriations Committee but it is important to the Ways and Means Committee from the standpoint of taxes. Certainly it is of great importance to all Members of the House. It is my fond hope that the House will continue to support this Federal catalog program and to insist that the armed services make of it a reality, and that the civilian component of our purchasing program also coordinate its activities and adopt the same catalog, which they are prepared to do, by the way, so that any surplus generated by the war will follow in smooth, logical fashion to the channels of disposal, and the tremendous waste that was entailed after World War II in the disposal program will not be repeated at the conclusion of this great struggle in which we are presently embarked.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I completely agree with what the gentleman has said with respect to the importance of the program, and the importance of bringing this information to the attention of Members of the House. I think the gentleman has performed a real service in calling it, not only to the attention of the House but to the attention of the general public as well, because only from that source can we get the emphasis needed to put these reforms into effect.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has given us a very interesting account of his work on this committee. I feel sure that we all share his view, that the study which he has advocated should be continued. As the gentleman leaves the Committee on Expenditures to go to the Committee on Agriculture, I feel personally, and I know a great many others share the same view, that I would like to express to the gentleman our thanks for the great aid which he has given us in resolving the questions that have come

out of his committee. I personally have always turned to the gentleman from Indiana, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE] for advice in connection with the problems that have come from his committee. I am personally grateful to the gentleman from Indiana for the distinguished service which he has performed.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that I express my very best wishes and hopes for the continued success of the great Committee on Expenditures of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

A REPORT TO THE CONGRESS FROM THE PEOPLE OF THE NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, JANUARY 19, 1951

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker and distinguished Members of the House, it is my privilege to again report to the Congress the views and feelings of the people of my district, the Ninth Congressional District of Alabama. This report from my people is tremendously important, in my opinion, because of the deep feelings they have expressed to me in this grave hour.

The serious world situation is uppermost in their minds, and let me tell you they have no patience with diplomatic niceties when their sons, husbands, and loved ones are being sent to war, some of them for the second time in the last decade, and many parents are receiving that dreaded telegram from the Adjutant General saying "I regret to inform you—" The people are facing the hard facts of life realistically and they expect our Government to act realistically.

The Ninth Congressional District of Alabama wants two-fisted, hard-hitting, intelligent leadership from the Executive, from the military, from the Congress, and from everybody in a place of public trust. Let no one forget this important fact as our people are being rallied to make greater sacrifices and greater efforts which are necessary for the protection of our country.

The people of my district have been ready to go all out for some time. They are willing and able to do whatever is needed to protect our country if given a reasonable plan of action and the fighting leadership which we must have to be successful.

My people know that Korea is worse than the Pearl Harbor of World War II which left no doubt in anybody's mind about the job we had to do. They also know that our direction and objectives have not been clarified in this crisis and that the necessary measures to protect our country have not been put into effect. They want bold leadership, with a positive course of action toward a definite goal. They want the best brains in this country drafted to help the executive branch of our Government steer that course. This includes the decision on when and where to use the atomic bomb.

Although the President has the chief responsibility for foreign affairs, my people feel that Congress should not just sit back and rubber stamp the plans and programs of the executive department. Charting the destinies of 151,000,000 American people in this shrinking, explosive world is too grave a responsibility for the Executive alone and my people expect Congress to take an active part in the formation of our foreign policy. The world's greatest deliberative body should deliberate on the world's greatest question—the question of bringing about peace—and come up with some realistic solutions to our dilemma.

The people of my district and Alabama have always been foremost in rising to the defense of our country in time of crisis when the danger and course of action were fully understood. They will not follow blindly. They want to know the whole truth about the dangers we face, the odds that are against us, and the reasons for the course we take.

The fact is—and we might as well face it—that we are at war with Russia although the fighting at the present time is taking place in the Far East. We are already in a war for our freedom here at home, if not for our very existence. The odds against us are greater than at any time in the history of our country. Nothing short of an intelligent plan of action to fight the Communists inside and outside our country, backed by the full force of the people, will prevent our destruction.

It has been next to impossible for my people to reconcile the bitter reverses in a far-off land with what they have seen here at home. On the one hand they have suffered the loss of loved ones in Korea, the drafting of young boys, the rising spiral of inflation, the call for greater sacrifices, and an instinctive realization of the gravity of the world situation. On the other hand they have seen inadequately trained troops sent into combat without proper reinforcements, the publication of secret military data, enactment of half-way control measures, the lack of cooperation among the two political parties and the Executive in cleaning out the Communists in Government, talk about police action in Korea, the small amount of support from members of the United Nations, failure of the UN to brand Communist China as an aggressor, the insistence by England on UN recognition of Red China, and continued war shipments by the allies to Russia and her war-making satellites.

Is it any wonder that great hope of a simple, easy solution was aroused in so many minds by the speeches of ex-President Hoover and Senator TAFT? They said much that I agree with, but they also left out some impelling facts about the world situation that must be taken into account.

It has been suggested that small United States garrison forces could hold out in different parts of the world while friendly nations rearm. This is impossible. The slaughter of our troops and the capture of friendly nations would be a certainty in an open military conflict. Who can trust the Soviets to stop military aggression of their own accord? It has been inferred that America can

stand alone. The facts do not give much support to this theory. We may be forced into such an undesirable position but it would be a short-sighted policy indeed to fail to help the development of economic, religious, and military resistance wherever we can find it. How else can atheistic aggression be stopped before it reaches our own shores? Our task will be increased a hundredfold if we try to go it alone.

All of us agree, however, that first priority should be given to building up our own defense. We demand it. We must also demand greater effort on the part of our allies, if they are to expect continued assistance from us. Not one of these countries, with the exception of Turkey, has waked up to its own peril to the extent of taking adequate military action.

Withdrawal of our troops from Korea may be a military necessity and it may be the wisest policy in view of the prospects of being thrown into an all-out war with China. So far China, with 450,000,000 people, has unleashed only a small part of her military forces. She has millions more in reserve. Russia is using Korea as a proving ground for tactics and equipment in preparation for bigger things to come. The solution depends upon our over-all policy regarding whether or not to abandon the entire Far East.

If we do not abandon the entire Far East, then all available forces must be used to stop Russia in that general area wherever and however it is militarily possible. The wraps must come off. Our fighting men and their families deserve this consideration. This would include strategic bombing wherever it is to our advantage. It would include the use of Korean guerrillas and troops, the estimated 1,500,000 Chinese guerrillas on the mainland, the 500,000 Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa who must be re-armed, the Japanese, and other friendly nations. All must be used in a way that is most advantageous to our cause. Among the objectives of this course of action would be to prevent Russia from getting added industrial power and to keep her from being able to concentrate entirely in Europe.

To abandon the entire Far East will mean the immediate collapse of Japan, a country that has no arms at this time but has great industrial power. Another result of such a policy would be to leave Formosa and the friendly guerrillas in Korea and China helpless. The Philippines and Alaska would be seriously threatened so that the direct effect would be to move the war zone closer home and destroy the morale of our allies in Europe.

The same policy of withdrawal applied to Europe would mean the inevitable collapse of such industrial powers as Germany and England, along with the entire European Continent. This would hand over to Russia control of about 90 percent of the world's manpower, and a combined industrial capacity comparable to ours, backed up by the world's largest army—an army which is ready to go into action now.

In case we withdraw from Europe and the Far East either voluntarily or involuntarily, we could not count on any-

thing but war coming to our own shores very quickly in the most devastating form yet known to man.

The greatest deterrent to a world war now is the temporary advantage we hold in the quantity and quality of the atomic bomb. However, we must bear in mind that Russia can send over one-way, suicide, sneak A-bomb attackers and level some of our cities at this very time. The power of our A-bomb is not great enough to win a war alone and our superiority in this field is fast diminishing. We must strengthen ourselves immediately to make up for this loss. The second greatest deterrent to a world war now is our long-range advantage in production which must be thrown into high gear before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, our people in the ninth district are representative of America in that they have too much faith in our way of life, too much character, vitality, and independence to bow to Russia. My people know down deep in their hearts that the forces of evil are not going to conquer the world ultimately. Atheistic communism cannot dominate the minds of men very long because such unfortunate people will eventually realize that they have been deceived by false promises. It cannot dominate the souls of men very long because man inevitably seeks a higher being. The religious and freedom-loving peoples of the world are slowly but surely lining up solidly against Russia for a showdown. But the number of us, both as individuals and as nations, who will be living to enjoy freedom again, is in direct proportion to the speed, vigor, and intelligence with which we tackle this task together.

The freedom of America was not easily won and it will not be easily defended. The safest course, Mr. Speaker, is bold, common-sense action. I submit the following programs for immediate consideration and urge their inclusion in our emergency policies:

First. Bring in top leadership for Government service and set up a permanent advisory commission to the President, on foreign affairs.

Second. Initiate a full-scale debate in the House of Representatives on foreign policy, adopting programs that have the backing of our people which is so necessary for success.

Third. Mobilize all industry; catalog every citizen according to his capabilities for emergency national service; step up production; work to keep production lines rolling.

Fourth. Stop publicity and leaks of secret military information which have caused unnecessary loss of lives.

Fifth. Concentrate on the improvement of our military intelligence.

Sixth. Place a complete embargo on Russia, Red China, and Soviet-dominated countries. Put more pressure on all countries who are sending war materials to Russia to prevent future shipments.

Seventh. Enact a plan for the Government to finance the war on a pay-as-you-go basis in the fairest possible manner. Cut out unnecessary nonmilitary spending.

Eighth. Effect across-the-board controls, including price and wage controls,

to stop run-away inflation which threatens to wreck our economy.

Ninth. Mobilize and fully train the necessary Armed Forces as quickly as possible, with particular emphasis on a permanent training program.

Tenth. Utilize the Japanese and Chinese Nationalists to the best possible advantage in the far-eastern war.

Eleventh. Speed up the mobilization of the army of Europe, pressing into service German, Spanish, French, and Yugoslavian troops.

Twelfth. Let Russia know we will use the atomic bomb when and where it will do the most good.

Thirteenth. Improve our counterspy and espionage system and make use of DP's in this connection as much as possible.

Fourteenth. Develop a strong civilian defense program.

Fifteenth. Take the initiative of world leadership away from atheistic Russia.

Sixteenth. Ask for divine guidance as our country is being called upon to lead the free world in the most crucial period of our history.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING
AND CURRENCY,
Washington, January 19, 1951.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House
of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 712 (a) (2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 774, Eighty-first Congress), I hereby appoint the following members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives as members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: PAUL BROWN, WRIGHT PATMAN, ALBERT RAINS, RALPH A. GAMBLE, HENRY O. TALLE.

Respectfully,

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, and include in one a telegram and in the other extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of a bill he is introducing today on unification of Ireland.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include appropriate material.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Washington Post by J. A. Livingston.

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from Dr. M. J. Horsch.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include quotations and other extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. Towe) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. Lecompte asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include resolutions by a group of American Legion posts and a statement by the Association of American Colleges.

Mr. EDWIN ARTEUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. D'Ewart asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in one a newspaper story.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include an editorial in each instance.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. D. Hayes Murphy.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he delivered today.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. ELLIOTT) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BREEN, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), un-

der its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 22, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

90. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military service and training, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

91. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter recommending a change in the proposed universal military service bill submitted by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

92. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide additional compensation for members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force during periods of combat duty in Korea"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

93. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the report of the American National Red Cross and the retirement system of the corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, pursuant to the act of Congress approved January 5, 1905 (33 Stat., p. 599), entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross", as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

94. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 1, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Parrotts Creek, Middlesex County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 46); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

95. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of the final valuations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to provisions of section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

96. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the Sixty-fourth Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

97. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the municipal council of St. Thomas and St. John, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Lands.

98. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

99. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to regulate the interception of communications in the interest of national security and the safety of human life"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

100. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the third annual report of claims paid by the Department of State during the calendar year 1950 under part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, as amended, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort

Claims Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1724. A bill to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1724. A bill to provide for the renegotiation of contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1725. A bill to establish a Commission on Cooperative International Relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1726. A bill to provide for the organization of the Air Force and the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 1727. A bill to provide that, in the determination of the amount which certain local educational agencies are entitled to receive for school-construction purposes, no reduction in such amount shall be made for prior construction under the WPA, PWA, and NYA programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 1728. A bill to authorize a program to provide for the construction of Federal buildings outside of, but in the vicinity of and accessible to, the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1729. A bill to amend section 410 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to cooperation with State commissions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1730. A bill to amend section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to make expenditures for land for radio monitoring stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1731. A bill to authorize the payment of interest on savings bonds retained after maturity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1732. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii and Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1733. A bill to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1734. A bill providing the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all aliens having a legal right to permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1735. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to prevent the loss of nationality of certain persons declared to be citizens of the United States under the Organic Act of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1736. A bill relating to the excise tax on cabarets, roof gardens, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1737. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1950, to provide a definition of the term "State"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1738. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1739. A bill authorizing an annual appropriation to provide more adequate facilities for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1740. A bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1741. A bill to provide for the retirement of any judge of the United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands, any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and any judge of a circuit court of the Territory of Hawaii after 10 years of service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 1742. A bill to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1743. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1744. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and section 118 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1745. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1746. A bill to amend subdivisions d and e of section 58 of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 1747. A bill to amend the limitation upon the total annual compensation of certain rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1748. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1749. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1750. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 1751. A bill to provide for the payment of increased special pensions to persons holding the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1752. A bill to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military service and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1753. A bill to provide additional compensation for members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force during periods of combat duty in Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1754. A bill to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1755. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1756. A bill to increase the fee of jurors in condemnation proceedings, instituted by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1757. A bill to amend section 3 of an act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia, approved February 11, 1929, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1758. A bill to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1759. A bill to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1760. A bill to provide for the appointment of a deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 1761. A bill relating to the salaries and expense allowances of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker and Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 1762. A bill for the safety of life and property by making all commercial fishing vessels subject to the rules and regulations of the United States Coast Guard marine inspection; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1763. A bill to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of justices and judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1764. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to settle, pay, adjust, and compromise certain claims for damages and for salvage and towage and to execute releases, certifications, and reports with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1765. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces in the Philippine Islands during hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unre-

married widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 1766. A bill to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Director of Public Health of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1767. A bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1768. A bill to establish the requirement that political statements concerning certain candidates for public office shall contain information relating to sponsorship and cost of publication or transmission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1769. A bill to strengthen the common defense by providing a domestic supply of soft fibers from kenaf and ramie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 1770. A bill to provide special pensions for certain persons awarded medals for extraordinary heroism while serving with the Armed Forces of the United States of America; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 1771. A bill to amend section 131 of title 4 of the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 1772. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1773. A bill to create a commission to enable the qualified voters of each State to register their opinions as to the national foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1774. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 1775. A bill to provide for a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 1776. A bill to designate the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the American Revolution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 1777. A bill to permit candidates in all services to qualify as aviation cadets without a college degree by abolishing present advanced educational requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1778. A bill to amend section 402 of title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1779. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1780. A bill to provide compensation for excess hours of work by certain employees of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1781. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships

for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 1782. A bill to provide an increased penalty for the sale of narcotic drugs to persons under 17 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1783. A bill making an appropriation for the preservation and repair of the Tower of Victory at Washington's Headquarters and Museum, Newburgh, N. Y.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 1784. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 1785. A bill to provide certain benefits with respect to disability or death suffered by a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces from an injury incurred while training under the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 1786. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Five Civilized Tribes and other Indians of eastern Oklahoma and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1787. A bill to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to make the Commandant of the Marine Corps a permanent member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1788. A bill to authorize the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Tribes of Indians to make contracts for professional legal services with approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution authorizing the International Joint Commission to make a survey to determine the most economical and most feasible plan for the construction of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal power project at Passamaquoddy Bay in the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick and authorizing the appropriation of not to exceed \$3,900,000 to defray the cost thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COX:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution relating to peanut acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Res. 78. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct studies and investigations of matters within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. Res. 79. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate the Alleged Abuses in the Education and Training Program of World War II veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. Res. 80. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make inves-

tigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 81. Resolution providing an increase in salary for an employee of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Res. 82. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to a photostatic copy of an interstate civil defense compact entered into and ratified by the Governor on behalf of the Commonwealth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1789. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Benjamin H. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of Dorothea Zirkelbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Joe Tortolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 1793. A bill for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Joseph Veich, also known as Giuseppe Veic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of Maria Benkiel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of Master Sgt. Robert A. Espe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1797. A bill for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1798. A bill for the relief of the estate of Yoshio Fukunaga, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Bella and Archie Kennison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of Chin Hien Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Kuraichi Honke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1802. A bill for the relief of Mokutaro Murakami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1803. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aki Oseto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1804. A bill for the relief of Yoichi and Uto Takara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1805. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Takino Kajikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1806. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ichi Yoshioka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1807. A bill for the relief of Sumie Kira Sakamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1808. A bill for the relief of Yonekichi Kagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1809. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Masa Izumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1810. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Setsu Takamori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1811. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toyo Ishizuka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1812. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shizu Takamura Asami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1813. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sumi Tanimitsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1814. A bill to authorize the admission of Flora Fung Wah Miu Wong to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1815. A bill for the relief of Hideo Ishida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1816. A bill for the relief of Shoemon Takano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1817. A bill for the relief of Eiichi Kishida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1818. A bill for the relief of Hego Fuchino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1819. A bill for the relief of Hisamitsu Kodani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1820. A bill for the relief of Evangelia Anastasios Theofilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 1821. A bill for the relief of Izumi Makiyoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1822. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Goakes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1823. A bill for the relief of Jose Encarnacion Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1824. A bill for the relief of Andrew M. Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1825. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1826. A bill for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1827. A bill for the relief of Laurance Anthony Warnock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 1828. A bill for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 1829. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1830. A bill for the relief of Remzi Gurcay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 1831. A bill to admit Luigi Morelli to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LeCOMPTE:

H. R. 1832. A bill for the relief of the Old King Coal Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 1833. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINNON:

H. R. 1834. A bill for the relief of Florence Grace Pond Whitehill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of J. Ellis Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carla Mulligan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1837. A bill for the relief of Rustom Bana, Adi Russi Bana, Nasli Russi Bana, and Narie Russi Bana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1838. A bill for the relief of Fong Bat Woon and Fong Get Nan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 1839. A bill to restore and continue in full force and effect patents Nos. 4,750, 16,436, 21,258, 17,679, and 23,984; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS (by request):

H. R. 1840. A bill for the relief of Bernard Spielmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1841. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Franchina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1842. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 1843. A bill for the relief of Nahan Abdo Haj Moussa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1844. A bill for the relief of Capt. William Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1845. A bill for the relief of Sam Paterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUINN:

H. R. 1846. A bill for the relief of James Zaloba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1847. A bill for the relief of Margaret Frankell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1848. A bill for the relief of the aliens Nicholas Partheniades, Catherine Partheniades, and their son, Constantine Partheniades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1849. A bill for the relief of the alien Malke Kresel Mohrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1850. A bill for the relief of Thomas O'Hare, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1851. A bill for the relief of Ark Ping Jee Nong (Ngon); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1852. A bill for the relief of the alien Hanna Florian Sulner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1853. A bill to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Maria Roza Tarnowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Papavasiliou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Antonio Luciano Musacchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of James Yao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 1858. A bill for the relief of sundry Australians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1859. A bill for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1860. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to render judgment on certain claims of George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW (by request):

H. R. 1861. A bill for the relief of Arthur DeWitt Janes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

16. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of Tioga County Pomona Grange, No. 30, urging a United Nations police force of volunteers trained and equipped under the direction of the UN and ready to serve anywhere in the world a crisis may arise, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, January 8, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father, in the abundance of Thy goodness another day is added to the record of life.

"Lord, for tomorrow and its needs we do not pray,

Keep us, our God, just for today."

For a day which now possesses great prospects, set Thou a seal upon our lips that no fault or error might mar its record. Grant unto us the clear shining light of truth for our minds as we seek in Thy will the best for those whom we have been called to serve. May Thy servants make daily the choice of spiritual integrity above the corruption of the world, and have clarity of insight amid the confusion of the present hour. "Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants, and Thy glory unto their children. And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us; and establish Thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it." In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 18, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until January 29.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MILLIKIN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for 2 weeks, beginning Wednesday.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the

District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hayden	Martin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hoev	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Neely
Byrd	Humphrey	Nixon
Capehart	Hunt	O'Connor
Carlson	Ives	O'Mahoney
Case	Jenner	Pastore
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Smathers
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Duff	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Lodge	Sparkman
Eaton	Long	Stennis
Ellender	McCarran	Taft
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Tobey
Frear	McFarland	Watkins
Fulbright	McKellar	Welker
George	McMahon	Wherry
Gillette	Magnuson	Wiley
Green	Malone	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions and present matters for insertion in the RECORD and in the Appendix of the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 48)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended,